THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL EXPERIENCES OF DROPOUTS: LABOUR MARKET SUCCESS AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

by

LESLIE SAMUELSON

(C)

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1988

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-45715-5

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR LESLIE SAMUELSON

TITLE OF THESIS THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL EXPERIENCES OF DROPOUTS: LABOUR MARKET SUCCESS AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED FALL 1988

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Leslie Samuelson

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

10654 84 Ave

Edmonton, Alberta

DATED Sept 16 1988

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL EXPERIENCES OF DROPOUTS: LABOUR MARKET SUCCESS AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR submitted by LESLIE SAMUELSON in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

.....

Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

External Examiner

Date...Sept. 10, 1986.....

Abstract

One of the few well founded propositions in criminology is that individuals who fail at school are most likely to engage in delinquent behavior while in school. However, what is not clear either theoretically or empirically is the effect that dropping out of school has on subsequent criminal behavior. In this thesis we argue that if we are to resolve this controversy over the criminal involvement of dropouts we must examine the out-of-school experiences of dropouts. The major empirical issue that we focus upon is the relationship between the out-of-school labour market integration of dropouts and their involvement in crime, as well as with drugs and alcohol. On the theoretical side, we extend social control theory by developing out-of-school measures of social controls, both labour market-based and other.

There were three specific research questions. One, to what extent were labour market-based social controls related to out-of-school deviance? Variation in the above relationship for different measures of crime, alcohol and drug use, as well as labour market integration, was also a concern. Two, to what extent were there notable differences in the labour market and crime relationship for (i) older versus younger and (ii) male versus female dropouts? Finally, to what extent were certain non-labour market social controls in the lives of dropouts related, either by themselves or in conjunction with labour market integration, to involvement in crime?

Cross-sectional quantitative and qualitative data on the out-of-school experiences of dropouts in Edmonton, Alberta were gathered as part of a larger Youth Employment and Unemployment Study in 1984-85. We found in certain instances that labour market-based social controls were related to involvement in crime, and with drug and alcohol use. We also concluded, as we had expected, that, while they were important, labour market-based social controls were not the only major social controls in the lives of dropouts. In addition, the relationship between labour market success and deviance certainly did vary depending on the measure of labour market success and deviant behavior utilized. Sex and age were found to have very little influence on the basic labour market-deviance relationship. On the other hand,

there were important interaction effects between labour market and non-labour market social controls on crime and illegal drug use. In general crime and illegal drug use were highest when dropouts were low on both sets of social controls, as social control theory would predict.

We thus concluded that crime control policies must move away from the current conservative push towards formal deterrance (i.e. increased incarceration). Instead, we must consider short and long-term policies designed to increase the more informal social controls provided by relatively successful integration into socially meaningful and economically rewarding forms of employment.

Acknowledgments

When one reads the final draft of a thesis the contribution of the people who supported and guided the research and write-up becomes especially obvious. To Tim Hartnagel I owe a great deal for his efforts over my period of study at the University of Alberta. To Harvey Krahn I also owe a great deal, particularly during the final push to get this thesis out the door. Les Kennedy, Bob Silverman, Anne-Marie Decore and Rick Linden, as committee members, also deserve a special note of thanks.

Still, none of this would likely have been possible without the support from good friends over the years of study. Mike Walsh, Randy Jones, Barb Marshall and Ray Morrow contributed greatly, often in ways they will not even know. The T.M.B. Alumni — Drew, Al and Robert — were also main contributers here.

Finally, but not least, I must thank the young people who agreed to participate in the study, especially those at the Youth Emergency Shelter. The In addition, Alberta Manpower, the Solicitor General of Canada, and the Centre for Criminological Research at the University of Alberta all provided funding for various components of the study.

Table of Contents

Chapter — Page

I. Introduction 1

A. Dropouts, Labour Market Failure and Crime: Empirical Research 3

The Centrality of Labour Market Integration 3

Changing Empirical Realities 5

Empirical Research on Out-Of-School Dropouts 7

B. Dropouts, Labour Market Failure and Crime: Theory 12

Theories of Criminogenesis: The Centrality of Control Theory 13

Extending Control Theory: Empirical/Theoretical Evaluations 14

Evaluating Out-Of-School Criminogenesis 21

Extending Social Control Theory: The Centrality of Labour Market Integration 24

C. Research Questions 28

II. Sampling, Measurement and Data Analysis 30

A. The Sample 30

B. Data Collection 32

Measuring Crime, Drug and Alcohol Use 35

Measuring Out-of-School Social Controls 40

Commitment 43

Labour Market Based Commitment 44

Labour Market Based Commitment: Final Measures 46

General Commitment 49

General Commitment: Final Measures 53

Involvement 54

Involvement: Final Measures 58

Attachment 58

Attachment: Final Measures 63

C. Data Analysis 63

III. Descriptive Statistics: Characteristics of Respondents 65

A. Age and Sex 65

B. Schooling 65

Reasons for Dropping Out 65

Length of Time Out of School 66

How Respondents Did in School 67

Highest Grade Finished in School 67

C. Employment 68

Current Employment Status 68

Total Number of Months Unemployed 69

Length of Jobs Held 70

Number of Jobs Held 71

Type of Job Held 72

D. General Commitment 72

Family Financial Status 73

Whom Was the Respondent Living With 73

Help From Family 74

Respondents' Financial Status 75

What Did Respondents Live On 76

Has the Respondent Had to Cut Back on Anything 78

E. Attachment 79

How Respondents Got Along With Family 79

How Often Respondents Got Together With Family 80

How Often Respondents Got Together With Friends 81

Whom Respondents Spent Time With 81

Whom Respondents Turned to With Problems 82

Was the Respondent Supporting Anyone 83

F. Involvement in Conventional Activities 84

Primary Things Respondents Did With Their Friends 84

Respondents' Membership in Clubs/Groups 84

Respondents' Participation in Sports 84

Respondents' Involvement With Hobbies 85

Respondents' Volunteer/Community Work 85

How Activities Changed Since Respondents Became Employed/Unemployed 86

G. Respondents Crime and Alcohol/Drug Involvement 87

Criminal Involvement - Specific Crimes 87

Criminal Involvement - Crime Indices 89

Alcohol and Drug Use 90

IV. Criminal, Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Integration 92

A. Labour Market Based Social Controls and Involvement in Crime 92

Current Labour Market Status 92

Dropouts' Criminal Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment 93

Dropouts' Criminal Involvement by Length of Jobs Held 94

Dropouts' Criminal Involvement by Number of Jobs Held 95

B. Labour Market Integration Based Social Controls and Alcohol/Drug Involvement 96

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Current Employment Status 96

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Total Months of Unemployment 97

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Length of Jobs Held ..98

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Number of Jobs Held 99

V. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Integration by Sex and Age ... 101

A. Criminal Involvement 103

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 103

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime Indices by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age 106

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime Indices by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 109

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime Indices by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 111

B. Alcohol and Drug Involvement 113

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 113

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment 115

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 117

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 119

VI. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Integration by Non-Labour Market Social Controls 122

A. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: ANOVA Main Effects 122

B. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Variables by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: ANOVA 2-Way Interactions 124

Crime/Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Non-Labour Market Social Controls 126

Crime/Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Non-Labour Market Social Controls 127

Crime/Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls 128

Crime/Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls 130

VII. Qualitative Data on the Dynamics of the Out-of-School Social Control of Crime Process 132

A. Qualitative Data Analysis 133

Non-Criminal Males: The Dynamics of Social Control 134

Criminal Males: The Dynamics of Social Control 139

Non-Criminal Females: The Dynamics of Social Control 147

Criminal Females: The Dynamics of Social Control 153

VIII. Conclusion 163

A. Summary of Results 163

B. Extending Social Control Theory: Implications of the Data 168

Research Question One 168

Research Question Two 173

Research Question Three 178

C. Extending Social Control Theory: Policy Implications of the Data 180

D. Future Research 188

References 192

Appendix I

Edmonton Youth Employment and Unemployment Study: Interview Schedule 205

Appendix II

Edmonton Youth Employment and Unemployment Study: Instructions to Respondents 209

Appendix III

Evaluating the Unemployment-Crime Relationship: Problems of Aggregate Data 216

Appendix IV

Descriptive Statistics for Labour Market Variables: Currently Employed and Unemployed Respondents 222

For the Currently Unemployed: 222

Length of Current Unemployment 222

Have Respondents Been Unemployed Before 223

Number and Length of Jobs Since High School 224

For the Currently Employed: 226

Length of Time at Current Job 226

Number of Other Jobs Respondent Has Had and Their Duration 227

Have Respondents Ever Been Unemployed/Length of Unemployment ... 228

Were Respondents Satisfied/Dissatisfied With Current Job 229

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Pearson Correlations - Property Crime Index Variables	37
2	Pearson Correlations - Violent Crime Index Variables	38
3	Pearson Correlations - Property Crime Index Variables by Violent Crime Index Variables	38
4	Respondents' Primary Reason For Leaving School	66
5	Highest Grade Respondent Finished In School	68
6	Respondents' Current Employment Status	69
7	Respondents' Total Number of Months Unemployed	70
8	Respondents' Length of Jobs Held	71
9	Respondents' Number of Jobs	72
10	Respondents Family Financial Status	73
11	Whom Respondents Lived With	74
12	Help From Family	75
13	Respondents' Financial Status	76
14	What Did Respondents Live On	77
15	Have Respondents Had to Cut Back on Anything	79
16	How Respondents Got Along With Family	80

17 How Often Respondents Got Together With Family 81

18 Whom Respondents Spent Time With 82

19 Whom Respondents Turned to With Problems 83

20 Respondents Involvement in Conventional Activities 86

21 How Activities Changed When Respondents Became Currently Employed/Unemployed 87

22 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime 89

23 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime: Total, Property and Violent 90

24 Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use 91

25 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Current Labour Market Status 93

26 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Total Months of Unemployment 94

27 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Length of Jobs Held 95

28 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Number of Jobs Held 96

29 Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Current Employment Status 97

30 Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Total Months of Unemployment 98

31 Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Length of Jobs Held 98

32 Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Number of Jobs Held 99

33 Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total) by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 104

34 Dropouts' Involvement in Property Crime by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 105

35 Dropouts' Involvement in Violent Crime by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 106

36 Total Crime by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age 107

37 Property Crime by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age 107

38 Violent Crime by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age 109

39 Total Crime by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 110

40 Property Crime by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 110

41 Violent Crime by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 111

42 Total Crime by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 111

43 Property Crime by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 112

44 Violent Crime by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 113

45 Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 114

46 Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age 115

47 Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age 117

48 Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age 117

49 Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 118

50 Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 119

51 Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 120

52 Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age 120

53 Crime/Drug Involvement by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: ANOVA Main Effects 123

54 Crime/Drug Involvement by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: Main Effects-Cell Means 124

55 Crime/Drug Involvement by Labour Market Variables by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-Way Interactions 125

56 Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Current Labour Status by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions 127

57 Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions 128

58 Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions 129

59 Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions 130

60 Non-Criminal Males: Dynamics of Social Control 135

61 Criminal Males: Dynamics of Social Control 140

62 Non-Criminal Females: Dynamics of Social Control 147

63 Criminal Females: Dynamics of Social Control 154

Appendix Table | Page

A1 Length of Current Unemployment 223

A2 Have Respondents Been Unemployed Previously 224

A3 Number and Length of Respondents' Jobs Since High School 225

A4 Number of Jobs Rspondents Applied For Per Average Week 226

A5 Respondents Length of Time at Current Job 227

A6 Number of Respondents Other Jobs and Their Durations 228

A7 Have Respondents Ever Been Unemployed/Length of Unemployment 229

A8 Were Respondents Satisfied/Dissatisfied With Current Job 230

I. Introduction

According to West (1984) and Braithwaite (1979:75), one of the few well-founded propositions in criminology is that "those who fail at school are most likely to engage in delinquent behavior." Thornberry et al. (1985:3) also note the general agreement that those who fail at school tend to be involved in delinquency while in school. They further state that, "what is not clear either theoretically or empirically is the effect that dropping out of school has on subsequent criminal behavior."

The theoretical controversy over the out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts stems from the fact that two major theories of criminogenesis, strain and social control, have offered rather divergent predictions. Strain theorists, such as Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), see the middle class environment of the school as a major source of frustration and alienation for lower class youth. In order to alleviate this frustration these youth reject middle class norms and turn to delinquency as an alternative source of success, status and approval. Strain theory thus sees the school as a major cause of criminal activity. Hirschi (1969), in his formulation of social control theory, posits that delinquency arises when the person's bond to conventional society is weak or broken. Individuals who are attached to conventional others, such as teachers, and are committed to conventional institutions such as schools, are strongly bonded to society and are thus seen as unlikely to engage in crime. Thornberry et al. (1985) note that:

> Based on these divergent viewpoints, strain and control theory present contradictory predictions concerning the effect of dropping out of high school on subsequent criminal involvement. According to strain theory, because dropping out eliminates the source of frustration brought about by failure in the school, criminal conduct should decline sharply following dropout. According to control theory, however, because dropping out reduces institutional control, criminal behavior should increase.

This theoretical controversy remains because the limited empirical research on the out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts has produced contradictory findings. Essentially there are three somewhat different pictures of the out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts. The central concern in these divergent studies is whether dropouts show a notable immediate decrease, a slow decrease or an immediate increase in criminal

involvement once they leave school. Let us elaborate on the research which largely produced this controversy.

First, the most influential view is almost certainly that of Elliot (1966) and Elliot and Voss (1974). To quote Elliot and Voss (1974:117), "The out-of-school [police contact] rates for dropouts indicate a dramatic reversal of the in-school trend" (cf. also Mukherjee, 1971; and Le Blanc et al., 1979). They report that official police contact rates decline to virtually zero within one to four years after dropping out. Self-report measures of delinquency involvement, while showing a general post-dropout decline, do not, however, show such a rapid decline.

On the other hand, empirical data from the Institute for Social Research (I.S.R.) Youth in Transition Project (1971, 1978) found no dramatic immediate post dropout decrease in delinquency. Self-report delinquency/crime rates subsequent to dropping out declined only gradually, with dropouts converging with, yet not equalling, graduates by their early twenties. Finally, in opposition to these two previous studies, Thornberry et al's. (1985:17) research indicates that delinquency rates increased in the year following dropout. In addition, they report, as do Polk et al. (1981), that throughout their early twenties dropouts have consistently higher rates of arrest than do graduates, and it is not until the mid-twenties that the rates for the two groups begin to converge.

Thornberry et al. (1985) present this increase in delinquency after dropout as the major finding of their study, and interpret it as supporting control theory. However, it is important to note that Thornberry et al. (1985) found an increase in delinquency in the year following dropout for only blue collar [1] and minority group subjects. The same increase was not found for white collar dropouts. Thornberry et al. (1985) do not discuss this difference. In particular, they do not consider how variation in labour market success by social status might explain why white collar dropouts crime rates converge very quickly with those of graduates, i.e. by age nineteen. Yet research shows that minorities and blue collar individuals are much more affected, negatively, by structural constraints in the labour market (cf.

[1] Fathers' occupation while the respondent was in high school was employed here.

Krahn, Lowe and Tanner, 1985 for Canadian statistics).

The existence of different maturation-out-of-crime curves for minority/blue collar and white collar dropouts indicates that social control theory's predictions about out-of-school criminal involvement only applies under certain conditions. A central factor determining the validity of the previous assertion may be the degree of out-of-school labour market success achieved by the dropout. [2] However, Thornberry et al. (1985), like many other researchers in this area, pay very little attention to the out-of-school experiences of dropouts, including their ability to achieve relatively successful labour market integration.

In this thesis the focus will not be upon evaluating strain versus control theory. Instead, it shall be argued that if the conflicting evidence over the out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts is to be reduced, the ability of dropouts to achieve relatively successful labour market integration must be examined. Thus, rather than testing two competing theories of criminogenesis, the major empirical issue needing attention is the relationship between poor labour market integration and involvement in crime. Having said this, let us consider the empirical and theoretical basis for this omission in past research on dropouts and crime.

A. Dropouts, Labour Market Failure and Crime: Empirical Research

The Centrality of Labour Market Integration

Why might labour market integration affect dropouts' maturation out of crime, and why has previous research nonetheless paid little attention to this relationship? There is considerable evidence that individuals mature out of crime as they move into their 20's and early 30's (cf. Greenberg, 1979). Virtually all researchers in this area, from diverse theoretical perspectives, have suggested that successful integration into the conventional adult world of

---

[2] Social control theory here appears to be making the same empirical prediction about dropouts' out-of-school involvement in crime, or lack thereof, as the strain based theory of Elliot and Voss (1974). Elliot and Voss (1974:124) predict that dropping out of school should be associated with lower delinquency rates only if the dropout "makes a satisfactory adjustment in the adult working community."

work and marriage is the key to this maturation process (cf. Hirschi, 1969:77, Greenberg, 1979:607 and West, 1980:317; Siegel and Senna, 1981; for an opposing view see Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1983:580). While perhaps disagreeing over the immediacy of the decrease in delinquency/crime, most researchers agree with Elliot and Voss (1974) who state that:

> ...[D]ropouts' decreasing involvement in delinquency would depend upon several contingencies in their out-of-school experiences, particularly employment and marriage. Dropout should reduce the motivation for delinquency to the extent that the dropout makes a satisfactory adjustment in the adult working community. Should he encounter difficulty in obtaining a job, establishing new friendships, and making the transition into an adult role, he has simply traded one type of failure for another, and we would not anticipate any dramatic decrease in his motivation for delinquent behavior.
> (Elliot and Voss, 1974:124)

Thus, successful labour market integration has been recognized to be a, if not the, major factor in dropout's maturation out of crime. But perhaps it was not a primary concern in previous studies because youth labour market prospects, including those of dropouts, were likely relatively good. The criminogenic impact of relatively unsuccessful labour market integration was thus not a critical issue when these studies were completed. Even Thornberry et al. (1985) use data from the 1945 Philadelphia birth cohort study and thus examine the experiences of dropouts in the late 1960's, a time when youth unemployment was not a serious social problem. Urban unemployment rates in the period in which the Elliot and Voss (1974), I.S.R. (1971, 1978) and Thornberry et al. (1985) data were gathererd were in the 6% range (cf. Current Population Reports, 1975). Moreover, in the period 1966 to 1976 the U.S. youth unemployment rate was in the order of 7-15% (cf. Table 36, Current Population Reports, 1978). The youth unemployment rate in the mid 1970's was approximately 13% (cf. Table 38, Current Population Reports, 1978).

Data from the I.S.R. (1978) research indicate that on only one dimension of successful labour market integration were dropouts disadvantaged relative to graduates after leaving school. To quote the I.S.R. (1978:232) research:

> Five years after graduation, those who ended their eduction with a high school diploma did not have noticeably better jobs than dropouts in terms of status, pay and job satisfaction. They did have better chances of avoiding unemployment.

While higher than the rate for graduates, the unemployment rate for dropouts — at 15.4% — was not appreciably higher than the general youth unemployment rate in the period under consideration.

Changing Empirical Realities

Support for the thesis that the out-of-school labour market experiences of youth have drastically changed in the last decade, especially for dropouts, is readily available. Rising youth unemployment rates have been particularly well documented. [3] Watson (1983:2) notes "unemployment has tripled in the industrial world in less than a decade and is likely to get worse." Research conducted in a Canadian city by Krahn, Lowe and Tanner (1985:1) recently concluded that "Unemployment has reached crisis proportions in Canada" (cf. also Taylor, 1984). [4]

Watson (1983), and Atkinson and Rees (1982) note that in all Western nations unemployment is disproportionately experienced by young people. Youth unemployment is a particularly serious problem in Canada (cf. Tanner et.al., 1985). In 1982 Canada ranked fifth among eleven OECD nations with the youth share of total unemployment reaching 42.6% in Canada. Youth also constituted 32.4% of the long term (12 months or more) unemployed in 1982. Canada here ranked second behind only the Netherlands. Converting these percentages into absolute numbers and using a conservative definition of unemployment, a Canadian Ministry for Youth (1984) publication stated that in an average week in 1983 some 579,000 youths aged 15-24 were without work.

While youth have been shown to be particularly vulnerable to unemployment, dropouts are most acutely affected by the current economic recession (Watson, 1983; I.S.R.,

---

[3] Unemployment is one major index of poor labour market integration; being underemployed and frequently changing low status jobs are others (cf. Witte 1979). Hills and Reubens (1984:310) note that the ratio of youth to adult wages, has deteriorated significantly in the past ten years. In addition, these authors note that research has found "consistent patterns of assignment and retention in the "bad" jobs through much of the youths working life."

[4] Unemployment rates have declined somewhat since these studies were published. However, in the province and city where the data for this thesis were obtained this decrease has not been overly substantial.

1978). A recent Canadian Ministry for Youth publication (1984:17) stated that unemployment rates are inversely linked to age and educational attainment. Among out-of-school youth, the rate for those aged 15 and 16 was 40.5% while for those aged 20-24 it was 19.9%. The rate for those with at least some post secondary education was 15.3% compared to 23.9% for those with no post-secondary education. While not specifically referring to dropouts, the above studies do indicate an inverse relationship between educational attainment and unemployment.

Further evidence on the relationship between educational attainment and labour market success comes from American research by Hills and Reubens (1984:282) and a 1983 Edmonton Public Schools Board study of dropouts. These studies noted that in the U.S. generally and in Edmonton, specifically, dropouts were facing unemployment rates in the fifty percent range. [5] As West (1984:169) has suggested:

> Elliot and Voss (1966, 1974) point out that working class dropouts are markedly less delinquent after leaving school. It must be admitted that contemporary economies seem unable to absorb such an influx into the already overcrowded labour market....

These previous statistics indicate that the structural realities of the current economy and labour market are such that dropouts are currently experiencing severe labour market integration problems. As Kraus (1979:21) states, "The world's economic situation of recent years has made it increasingly difficult ... for young people to secure a job essential to their gaining the social foothold for adulthood." However, as shall be seen in the following section, existing empirical research on dropouts really has not addressed the relationship between labour market success, or lack thereof, and delinquency/crime.

---

[5] An Edmonton Public Schools Board (1983) study provides some evidence, albeit limited, that the educational system is progressively being abandoned by many youths. This study, of two Edmonton high schools, found that the dropout rate increased from 1.9% to 12.9% and from 9.7% to 32.8% respectively, in the period from 1970-71 to 1982-83. Recent research in Ontario also found a 33% high school dropout rate (cf. Tanner and Krahn, 1988, on the Radwanski Report).

Empirical Research on Out-Of-School Dropouts

Existing research is limited with regards to the out-of-school experience of dropouts. It is, moreover, particularly limited in the area of the relationship between unsuccessful labour market integration, which is usually indexed by unemployment, and criminal involvement. Recent research on the dropout and delinquency/crime issue is essentially concerned with establishing whether delinquency causes school failure or vice versa (Phillips and Kelly, 1979); whether there are class differences in school leaving and/or the aetiology of delinquency (Krohn and Massey, 1980; Hartnagel and Tanner, 1982); or whether schools, because of the nature of their programs, produce delinquent youths (West, 1984).

The only major published sociological studies of the out-of-school experiences of dropouts are those previously noted: Elliot and Voss (1974), the I.S.R. Youth in Transition Project (1971, 1978) and, to a lesser extent, Thornberry et al. (1985). But these studies said little about what happens when dropouts leave school and do not achieve relatively successful employment (cf. earlier research by Jeffrey and Jeffrey, 1970).

Elliot and Voss (1974:111) build upon earlier empirical research by Elliot (1966) which indicated that male dropouts had higher official police referral rates while in school than after dropout. Consistent with this earlier research, they combine the strain theory views of Cloward and Ohlin (1960) with those of Cohen (1955), and state that, in opposition to Hirschi (1969), "delinquency and dropout are alternative responses to the experience of failure and frustration generated primarily in the context of the school" (Elliot and Voss, 1974:109). Consistent with this in-school focus Elliot and Voss, while employing a longitudinal design, concentrate on the delinquency of dropouts and graduates from the ninth grade to just prior to graduation from twelfth grade. This means that information was only gained for youths from 14 to 18 years of age. Moreover, the highest proportion (260 of 475) of dropouts left between the latter half of the eleventh and near the end of grade twelve. A high proportion of dropouts in this study were thus only "at risk" for out-of-school delinquent/criminal involvement for a very short period of time.

While providing valuable insights into the relationship between dropping out of school and delinquency, this study really can not speak to the concern with the impact of out-of-school failure in the labour market on the criminal behavior of dropouts. Not only did the study restrict its coverage to youths from age 14 to 18, but it also reported on delinquent behavior, as measured by self report data, for only nineteen unemployed dropouts.[6] Furthermore, of the 109 dropouts who were specifically targeted as the sub-sample on whom the impact of unemployment was to be assessed, a full fifty percent never completed the final interview and were thus excluded. Attrition rates such as this can introduce severe bias in the results, protests of the researchers notwithstanding. With a fifty percent attrition rate it is questionable whether the final sub-sample was representative of the original sample as well as the general population of dropouts. Problems of small sample size in most categories of analysis thus plague both the official police contact and self-report delinquency data. For example, Elliot and Voss (1974:126), while trying to unravel the contribution that employment and marriage make to out-of-school delinquency, state of the official police contact data that:

> The rate for unemployed dropouts is ... greater than for employed dropouts, but the difference is limited. As expected, males who were unmarried and unemployed had the highest rate of police contacts, whereas married and unemployed males had the lowest rate. The finding must be viewed with caution, because there were very few cases of this type — most of the married male dropouts were also employed .... In general the same conclusions apply to female dropouts, but the limited number of police contacts they experienced forces us to view these findings as highly tentative.

Elliot and Voss (1974:126) have similar problems with self-report data on delinquency. In Table 5-9, which presents their self-report data relating employment and delinquency, only part-time employed versus unemployed data are presented. Full-time employment and/or variation in employment over the three-year period covered by the self-report delinquency measure are not reported. Elliot and Voss (1974:126) attribute this limitation to the low number of cases involved. Elliot and Voss (1974:127) here offer what is at best only a tentative conclusion:

---

[6]The number of unemployed dropouts on whom official data were gathered, Table 5-8, is not reported by Elliot and Voss, 1974.

> ...it appears that unemployment is associated with higher levels of self-reported delinquency for married and unmarried males, as well as for unmarried females.... The number of cases is small, but the relationships are similar whether self report or police contact data are employed, and this lends credence to the general finding.

The I.S.R. Youth in Transition project research (1971:10) was primarily concerned with evaluating "what characteristics of schools are associated with high dropout rates," as well as distinguishing "between dropping out as a symptom of prior difficulties and dropping out as a problem in its own right, leading to new or increased difficulties." While more concerned with evaluating the appropriateness of a national anti-dropout campaign, given this in-school and before/after dropout orientation, the data from this project essentially follow the general in-school as a cause/cure of delinquency paradigm discussed previously, and suffer many of the same limitations.

In terms of the present concern with the out-of-school labour market-delinquency relationship for dropouts, the I.S.R. (1971) study is of quite limited utility. Much like the Elliot and Voss (1974) study, data were gathered on youths from approximately 14-18 years of age. Moreover, in addition to focusing upon male subjects, this study only followed youths from the time they entered grade ten in 1966 to 1970, which is one year after most respondents graduated, or would have had they not dropped out. Out-of-school processes thus receive much less analysis than in-school.

In particular, one must note that complete data from the first to final collection period (I-IV) were gathered for less than half of those who dropped out-of-school. Dropouts on whom complete data were gathered represented only approximately seven percent — or 157 subjects from 2213 boys — of the original sample. The problem of few respondents is especially acute when the I.S.R. (1971:132) study attempts to deal with the issue of dropouts, unemployment, and delinquency. Given the limitations of the data, the I.S.R. (1971:131-2) study states that it really can not speak to this issue, apart from concluding that differences between employed and unemployed dropout's delinquent activity generally existed well before dropout.

Let us now consider the more recent I.S.R. (1978) research. This study was not specifically concerned with dropouts per se. However, it did attempt to correct some of the limitations in the 1971 research by gathering additional data on dropouts, as compared to high school graduates with no college and those with some college, four years after the point of graduation. The study was more concerned in many respects with documenting change and stability in the relationship between earlier factors, such as education, ability and family background, and later behaviors/affective states, such as occupational attainment, self-esteem, as well as criminal behavior and drug use, for each of these three groups.

A central consequence of this focus was that the data on poor labour market integration, as indexed by unemployment, and delinquency/crime for dropouts, while suggestive, are very limited and the results explicitly stated to be quite tentative. A central reason for this is again the small sample size for unemployed dropouts. The I.S.R. (1978:108) study only ended up with 18 unemployed dropouts in a total sample of 1,628 youths. Moreover, the study used a simple dichotomous (yes-no) measure of current unemployment. Subsequent researchers such as Hackim (1982:440) declare that, in and of itself, this measure may be virtually useless when studying the impact of unemployment on youth as youth have been shown to switch in and out of jobs quite frequently. Thus, the designation employed or unemployed may be of limited utility (cf. Witte, 1979). A better measure of the impact of unemployment is obtained by gathering data on the total duration of all unemployment spells in the preceeding two or three years (cf. Hackim, 1982:440).

While limited, the I.S.R. study did provide some suggestive findings. As in 1971, it was generally concluded that while delinquency differences were largely a function of long standing patterns of behavior, often extending back to junior high, the immediate labour market experience of dropouts was nevertheless important. To quote the I.S.R. (1978:216) study:

> Unemployment was one aspect of environment or experience which appeared to have some direct impact on our measure of interpersonal aggression. The effect showed up most clearly for the dropouts who were unemployed — a finding which matches the relatively low self-esteem scores we observed for this group.

Similar effects were not observed for theft, vandalism, and a composite seriousness of delinquency measure of criminal activity. On the other hand the I.S.R. (1978:217-8) study stated of drug use that:

> ... employment (versus unemployment) showed rather little relationship with alcohol and cigarette use. But the data indicated that failure to find a job may contribute to illegal drug use.... Our findings in this area are suggestive, but not definitive. In each case an alternative path of causation is possible. But the fact that we are dealing with different patterns of change in behaviors, rather than stable differences in behaviors, leads us to favour an explanation in terms of environmental/experiential impact.

Based upon the previous review of the I.S.R. (1978) research, one can but agree when the study states that, as over 90% of the sample were employed, "it cannot explain the unemployment dimension of labour market experience" (1978:73, emphasis added, cf. also Kohen, 1973).

Thornberry et al. (1985) attempted to avoid some of the methodological problems in previous research on dropouts in order to provide a more definitive answer to the strain versus control theory controversy over whether in-school processes cause/cure delinquency. Given this objective, they analyze the in-school and out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts from age 16 to 25.

In terms of the present concern with the relationship between poor labour market integration and involvement in criminal activity, the Thornberry et al. (1985) research, like that previously reviewed, is only suggestive. In Addition to gathering data on males only, the study attempted to evaluate "... whether dropping out of high school alters (i.e. whether it increases or decreases) the general downward trend in criminal involvement," which occurs largely after age sixteen (1985:6). Consistent with this specific objective Thornberry et al. (1985) simply control for the two major out-of-school anti-criminogenic experiences noted by Elliot and Voss (1974), namely successful labour market integration, as indexed by employment, and marriage. They do not, however, consider the role that changing labour market realities for dropouts over time may play in why this main maturation out-of-crime with age effect occurs in the first place. Why do these authors skirt this issue?

Thornberry et al. (1985) are here following what is almost certainly the minority view in criminology, namely that of Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983). These latter authors deny the critique levelled against control theory (cf. Siegel and Senna, 1981) that it does not adequately explain maturation out-of-crime with age, by denying the criminological relevance of the variables thought by many to be critical in such maturation. It is essential to note that one variable which is prematurely dismissed from any maturational and/or causal analysis is successful labour market integration. These limitations are conceivably all the more problematic in that Thornberry et al. (1985) find that unemployment, but not marriage, is positively associated with criminal behavior. However, this finding is also limited since they only analyze the impact of these two potentially major out-of-school criminogenic experiences for males from 21-24 years of age, with the rationale that prior to age twenty-one the number of married subjects was too small for analysis.

Finally, while avoiding a simplistic currently employed/unemployed analysis by gathering data on the unemployment history of dropouts from high school to time of final interview, their measure of labour market success is still fairly crude. As Witte (1979) notes, the variable of labour market success has many more dimensions than simply being employed, such as intrinsic rewards, job status and remuneration etc. In addition to this, Grainger (1981) has stated, after a comprehensive review of the empirical data on the unemployment causes crime thesis, that unemployment per se may be important, but that any evaluation of its criminogenic impact must also take into account a reasonably broad range of other factors in the lives of individuals.

B. Dropouts, Labour Market Failure and Crime: Theory

The concern so far has been to establish that there has been little research on a potentially significant out-of-school anti-criminogenic process in the lives of dropouts, namely relatively successful labour market integration. This lack of knowledge is, in large part, the result of the domination of research on dropouts and delinquency by static in-school based theories of criminogenesis, as well as the specific labour market reality in the 1960-70's

period.

Thornberry et al. (1985) correctly stated that most empirical research on dropouts — in or out of school — including their own, has been concerned with evaluating in-school based theories of criminogenesis. Specifically, such studies have attempted to ascertain whether dropping out of school (a) reduces in-school generated strain and thus delinquency, as predicted by Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960); or (b) causes delinquency due to the reduction of in-school based controls, as predicted by Hirschi (1969). Dropout-delinquency research has thus formulated and maintained a very limited static theoretical model of the causes of delinquency/crime, with in-school processes being the dominating concern.

In this section the focus shall be on how this overriding concern with in-school causes of delinquency has restricted the advancement and adequacy of criminological theory. We will argue that the analysis of out-of-school criminogenic factors, particularly labour market success/failure, is necessary in order to produce an empirically more adequate and generalizeable social control theory of the causes of delinquency and adult crime. Within this general extension of social control theory, three sub-dimensions shall be specified as needing particular attention, namely (i) variation in the salience and nature of social controls over time, (ii) male-female differences in the out-of-school social control process, and (iii) variation in the social control of criminal behavior by type of offence.

Theories of Criminogenesis: The Centrality of Control Theory

Box (1981:121) is not alone when he notes that traditional criminological theory is in the "doldrums," given the limited ability of existing theory to explain the causes of crime and/or provide solutions to such. In his words: "it would appear that the attempts of some sociologists to locate that Holy Grail of criminology — a special motivational account of delinquency — have not been entirely successful." (1981:121).

Box (1981), Hagan (1977, 1985) as well as Vold and Bernard (1986) nonetheless, concur with Krohn and Massey (1980:529) when they state that social control theory does

have greater potential for explaining crime.

> One of the more significant theoretical contributions in the study of crime and delinquency in the recent past has been the development of social control theory by Travis Hirschi (1969). A major advantage of Hirschi's theory is that there is a strong link between the theoretical propositions and supportive research (Hindelang, 1973). The support provided by such research led Gibbons (1979:121) to conclude that "there are several signs that suggest that Hirschi's theory is to be one of the more enduring contributions to criminology. Krohn and Massey (1980:529)

Krohn and Massey (1980:529) note, however, that the strength of social control theory is not necessarily its' present ability to explain and predict crime (cf. Thomas and Hyman, 1978; Johnson, 1979; and Hagan, Simpson and Gillis, 1979). Instead, it is the potential for modification and extension of social control theory which are most appealing. Krohn and Massey (1980:529) conclude:

> Whether or not Gibbons' conclusion is prophetic largely depends on the results from research which extend and refine the basic propositions of the theory.

Extending Control Theory: Empirical/Theoretical Evaluations

Vold and Bernard (1986), but particularly Krohn and Massey (1980) and Box (1981) agree with West (1984:97-8) when he states that "success in explaining delinquent behavior does not mean that control theory is without criticism or problems," for "it too is incomplete theoretically and empirically." West (1984:98) here elaborates further:

> ... empirically, there are questions about the adequacy of control theory as a general theory of delinquency. Almost all the data supporting it are from self-report studies of typical adolescents, few of whom are officially in trouble ... these surveys suffer from their own methodological problems, and serious delinquency, either violent or costly, tends to be buried. (emphasis added)

This criticism by West (1984) should not be overly surprising, for while ostensibly a general theory of the causes of delinquency, the focus Hirschi's (1969) research, and thus in large part his theory, is on the causation of relatively trivial in-school adolescent delinquency (cf. Box, 1981:153; and Agnew, 1985:58). [7] Recent empirical evaluations of social control

[7] Box (1981) and Hagan (1985) both consider the issue as to whether social control theory is inherently unable to explain more serious crime, particularly economically and socially costly 'crimes of the powerful.' The best estimate is that social control

theory have also concluded that Hirschi's (1969) school, family and future aspirational-based formulation of control theory is too limited to provide a general theory of delinquency, let alone of adult crime. Here one may quote Vold and Bernard (1986:248):

> ... control theories are generally supported by one type of data — self-report surveys — and they provide a good explanation of one type of crime, the less serious forms of juvenile delinquency. However, they are not as yet supported by studies that focus directly on more serious delinquency or on adult criminality.

By way of summarizing this general critique of control theory, we may note that Hagan (1985) credits Wiatrowski et al. (1981) with conducting one of the most extensive tests of social control theory to date. Hagan (1985) is, moreover, in close accord with Wiatrowski et al. (1981:526) when these latter authors state that "The modest predictive power of Hirschi's constructs suggests that additional elements of the bond should be considered." Obviously, one major area needing attention in an extended social control theory is variation in the social control process as adolescents grow into adulthood.

Variation in Social Controls Over Time

Recent research supports the critique of social control theory levelled by Vold and Bernard (1986). Based upon his research Agnew (1985:59) reported that:

> Overall the data suggest that the explanatory power of Hirschi's social control theory has been exaggerated. First, the explanatory power of the theory diminishes as we focus on more serious forms of delinquency. [Second] The data in this study indicate that social control theory is unimportant in predicting delinquency among middle to older adolescents.

---

[7](cont'd) theory does have considerable potential for explaining relatively serious street-crime among adolescents and young adults. However, with concepts such as attachment, commitment and involvement it is, in and of itself, much less able to be expanded to explain serious white-collar crime. Most research has focused upon in-school youth and utilized a composite delinquency scale. While focussing upon some relatively serious criminal acts (i.e. assault with a weapon, theft over 50 dollars etc.) these scales nonetheless still contain many relatively trivial delinquency/crime measures (i.e. status offences, theft under 5 dollars etc.). As Krohn and Massey (1980:529) note, one major problem here is that most research only reports the relationship between social control measures and the global delinquency/crime scale. It is thus difficult to tell how well social control theory is able to predict offences of varying seriousness and type (cf. Johnson, 1979; for one study which does deal with specific types of offences).

Agnew (1985) notes that recent research by LaGrange and White (1983) found that the importance of parental attachment and school commitment peaked in mid-adolescence and declined rapidly thereafter. Agnew (1985:58) here states that as "adolescents become more autonomous and their futures become more certain, variations in family and school life may become less important to them." Recent research on social control theory by LaGrange and White (1985:19) similarly concluded that:

> The findings indicate that the processes related to delinquency change considerably as youths age through adolescence ...

Indeed Johnson (1979:141), in a major test of social control theory, reported that as early as 15-16 years of age in his sample that, "these young people's situational decisions to abide by or break the law are almost unaffected by the nature of their ties with their parents."

The previous research indicates that social control theory is, in certain crucial respects, empirically inadequate. Specifically, it is apparently unable to explain the causes of serious delinquency and crime among older adolescents and young adults. This research also suggests that the salient social control processes in the lives of youths change over time, with parent/school and aspiration-based controls likely losing salience as youths age.

The most significant limitation of control theory, in this author's view, is in its failure to analyze what progressively becomes, as youths grow into adulthood, the major out-of-school social control process in the lives of individuals, namely the degree of labour market integration. This we shall demonstrate in the subsequent review of (i) Thornberry and Christenson's (1984) statement on how labour market integration, particularly unemployment, determines social bonding and, (ii) Hirschi's (1969) explicit statement on the centrality of labour market integration for the social control of delinquency/crime.

There is a potential stumbling-block in the way of such an extension of social control theory. Social control theorists have generally not explored the issue of changes in the salience and nature of varying elements of the social bond over time. One reason perhaps is that Hirschi (1969:235), but especially Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983), explicitly argue that social control theory need not take account of age, or maturational reform in explaining the causes

of crime. A primary basis for this argument, according to Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983:554), is that the age distribution of crime is basically constant across social and economic conditions. They also state that the "identification of the causes of crime at any age may suffice to identify them at other ages as well" (for a rejoinder to Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1983, see Greenberg, 1985).

Research by Hagan (1986) indicates that Hirschi (1969) and Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) are not correct about the constancy of maturation out of crime across social and economic conditions. [1] Moreover, as Johnson (1979) noted in his major attempt to extend social control theory:

> It is assumed a priori that similar causal processes operate in generating delinquent behavior from very early adolescence (age eleven or twelve) until the youth forms other bonds or attachments not included in the model (such as higher education, full-time employment, marriage). But, of course, the question of extendability of results along the age continuum is an issue for empirical research.

Based upon the previous discussion, it would appear that an attempt to extend social control theory, via an analysis of out-of-school labour market-based social controls, is necessary. This refined question is — to what degree does attachment, particularly parental attachment, give way to and/or combine with labour market integration-based social controls on delinquency/crime as youths mature? As shall be seen in the subsequent discussion of Thornberry and Christenson (1984) and Hirschi (1969), it is the elements of commitment and

---

[1] In terms of the present concern with how structural realities of the labour market may affect out-of-school social bonding, it is essential to state that research by Hagan (1986) and Thornberry et al. (1985) does indicate that Hirschi and Gottfredson are incorrect under certain social-structural conditions. Hagan (1986) found different maturation out-of-crime curves for Native versus non-Native women. Hagan (1986:201) notes the view expressed by Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) but states, "We think this exception to the invariance Hirschi and Gottfredson cite derives in large part from the dramatic structural differences in life experiences ... The argument is easily made that this [natives] is one of the most severely disadvantaged groups in Canadian society." As noted previously, Thornberry et al. (1985:17) find different out-of-school maturation curves for minority/blue collar versus white collar dropouts. Research shows that minorities and blue collar individuals are much more affected than white collar individuals by structural constrictions in the labour market (cf. Krahn, Lowe and Tanner, 1985 for Canadian statistics). Both of these studies indicate that social control theory may have to incorporate some emphasis upon structural strain towards crime (cf. also Kornhauser, 1978).

involvement which are apparently most directly affected by labour market integration.

The above refinement in the basic research question — does labour market integration function as a social control on delinquency/crime — is necessary in order to produce an empirically and theoretically more adequate social control theory. A further review of the literature on social control theory, however, reveals that two other major refinements are also necessary.

To date we have been using generic terms like "dropouts" and "delinquency/crime" in our discussion. Yet as Krohn and Massey (1980) and Gomme (1986) note, two major areas needing further examination and refinement in a social control analysis are male-female differences in the social control process and, variation in the social control-crime relationship across various sub-categories of criminal offences.

Male-Female Variation in Social Controls

Box (1983:178) reviews the empirical research utilizing social control theory to explore the issue of male versus female involvement in criminal behavior (cf. Hagan, Simpson and Gillis, 1979; Johnson, 1979; Shover et al., 1979; Smith, 1979; Krohn and Massey, 1980). He then concludes that "all report results in broad agreement with control theory's major lines of argument, and show that the social location of females typically contains more of those factors which act as constraints on delinquent behavior."

Social control theory can in large part explain the lower involvement of females in crime. Yet both Gomme (1986) and Krohn and Massey (1980) argue that this limited success should not obscure some major problems of analysis. Gomme (1986:180) noted that there are very few comprehensive analyses of the causal structures precipitating male and female involvement in delinquent behavior (yet, cf. Smith, 1979). In what limited research exists, some studies indicate the existence of distinct differences in causality, while others find that those differences that do exist are minimal. Hagan, Simpson, and Gillis (1979), for example, note the tendency for the nature of social control mechanisms to differ markedly for males and females and suggest that these differences influence the opportunity for male and female involvement in delinquency. Alternatively, Johnson (1979) and Segrave and Hastad (1981)

maintain that causal differences are slight while D.A. Smith (1979) argues that there are no differences at all.

The results obtained by Krohn and Massey (1980) and particularly Gomme (1986) further substantiate the need to consider male-female differences in the social control process. Gomme (1986:188) states that results of the regression analysis suggest that the causal structures of deviance for males and females differ from one another. However, whereas Krohn and Massey report a greater portion of variance in female delinquency to be explained by social control variables, Gomme (1986) reports the opposite. Krohn and Massey (1980:542) also find commitment to be more important than attachment in explaining female delinquency.[9] However, as Gomme (1986:186) notes, commitment factors, such as school performance, have generally been seen as more important for the social control of male delinquency.

Variation in the Social Control Process by Type of Offence

Gomme (1986) concurs with Krohn and Massey (1980:532) when they state that: "It is too early to accept Smith's (1979) conclusion that the processes by which males and females come to commit deviant behavior are similar." Gomme (1986) notes, however, that when one also considers the issue of varying sub-categories of criminal acts, the problem is compounded. According to Gomme (1986:180), very few assessments of the consistency of etiological processes for males and females among subsets of delinquent behaviors have been forthcoming to date (Hindelang et al., 1981). Not only are there questions regarding the extent and nature of causal differences between male and female delinquent behaviors but there are also uncertainties with respect to whether causal inputs vary for each sex by type of misconduct. Earlier research by Krohn and Massey (1980:529) supports Gomme (1986). Krohn and Massey (1980:532) echo the earlier views of Johnson (1979:133) when they state that, the data fail to justify any conclusions about special mechanisms in the causation of different types of juvenile crime. Krohn and Massey (1981) add that they are not trying to

[9] Krohn and Massey (1980:533) are here employing a measure of commitment which is somewhat broader than Hirschi (1969).

downplay the finding of slight differences. They conclude rather that these slight differences surely are leads for much needed exploration into the possibility of distinct antecedents for distinct kinds of delinquent acts.

The previous research by Gomme (1986) and Krohn and Massey (1980) was primarily concerned with the criminal involvement of youth. However, Horwitz (1984) in a recent state-of-the-art review of the research evidence linking economic factors and social pathology, such as crime, has stated that the problem of refining one's analysis to include various sub-sets of crime is a general concern in criminological research. Referring primarily to aggregate data-based research and considering the variable of unemployment, Horwitz (1984:103) states that some researchers have found an association between unemployment rates and some types of crime but not others (cf. Henley and McPheters, 1974; Danziger, 1976; Brenner, 1976; Humphries and Wallace, 1980; and DeFronzo, 1983). Horwitz (1984:103) notes that there is little consistency, however, as to the types of crime associated with unemployment, except that higher burglary rates are likely to follow elevated rates of unemployment (cf. Appendix III for an analysis of the problems with aggregate data based tests of the labour market success-crime relationship).

We have outlined the general controversy over differences in the social control process by gender and sub-categories of offence. Let us now turn to the relevance of these concerns for a labour market integration-focused extension of social control theory. Virtually all of the control theory research has studied in-school adolescent delinquency/crime (cf. Hagan, Simpson and Gillis, 1979; Johnson, 1979; Krohn and Massey, 1980; Gomme, 1986). It is in this context that LaGrange and White (1985) and Vold and Bernard (1986) have concluded that social control theory is most solidly supported by empirical research generally. But gender and type of offence, are also relevant variables for an out-of-school analysis.

As Box (1983:180) notes, females have traditionally placed less emphasis on their occupational success than males. Furthermore, when females do display deviant behavior they are less likely than men to engage in street-crime and more likely to engage in retreatist behavior such as drug/alcohol abuse, which may or may not be criminal. Including gender and

sub-type of offence (including drug/alcohol abuse) in the present analysis of labour market-based social controls on criminal behaviors is thus particularly important.

Evaluating Out-Of-School Criminogenesis

The definition and measurement of labour market and non-labour market factors which should be included in the analysis need to be defined. Let us deal first with the issue of labour market integration.

In the present research the emphasis has been upon explicating how 'labour market integration', not simply unemployment, may be related to delinquency/crime. One major criticism of previous studies on dropouts (cf. Elliot and Voss, 1974; Thornberry et al., 1985; and to a lesser extent, I.S.R., 1971, 1978), and the yet to be presented social control statements on the labour market-crime relationship (cf. Thornberry and Christenson, 1984; Hirschi, 1969) is that they generally have, either explicitly or implicitly, simplistically conceptualized the labour market factor as "being unemployed, yes-no". Witte (1979), Grainger (1981), and Hackim (1982) each review a wide range of literature largely employing this dichotomized variable and state that it has been singularly unsuccessful at teasing out the contribution that success-failure in the labour market makes to involvement in crime.

Witte (1979) gives an extensive review of the literature on the labour market performance of parolees (cf. Hardin, 1975; Witte, 1976; Feyerherm, 1976; and Waller, 1974), and interventionist programs based on the assumption that improved economic viability will lower criminal activity (cf. Rossi, Berk and Lenihan, 1980; and Maynard, 1979). Echoing earlier empirical research on youths by Erickson (1975), Witte (1979:30) states: "As a whole these results seem to indicate that it is not so much individual unemployment per se which causes crime, but rather the failure to find relatively high wage satisfying employment."

Hackim (1982:440), moreover, notes that many young people switch in and out of generally low paying jobs quite frequently. The designation employed/unemployed at any one point in time may thus almost be a matter of chance. She also notes that the impact of unemployment (i.e. here upon social controls) may vary with the frequency and duration of

unemployment. Hackim (1982:440) states that individuals with repeated spells of short-term unemployment may not experience the same shock at job loss as those with no previous unemployment experience. However, Hackim (1982:440) notes that they might be particularly hard-hit, in that the total unemployment experience would have cumulative effects on their financial and social circumstances, and indeed even their employability.

Hackim (1982) states, as does a major 1984 Canadian Ministry for Youth publication, that when studying the potential impact of employment on delinquency/crime, the best approach would be to analyze the early work history of youths. Here one would keep track of the total duration of unemployment, as well as the pattern of labour market activity (i.e. employed full/part-time etc.).

Grainger (1981) broadens the range of concerns that one must attend to in order to fully evaluate the employment-crime relationship. Based upon his evaluation of the empirical research on this topic, Grainger (1981:46) states that an individual's

> ... employment status is only one of several possible contributing factors to criminal behavior. It is clear that the appropriate model to use in understanding criminality is a multi-variate systems model, where organized complexity is the norm. Unemployment per se may be a significant variable within such a system but it is only one of many factors.

This summary quote from Grainger (1981) is important. Dorn and South (1983), Clarke and Clissold (1982) and Greenberg (1979) note the impact of unemployment, and we would add poor labour market integration, may be conditioned by several essentially non-individual labour market factors.

Clarke and Clissold (1982:887) state in a recent study on the correlates of adaptation to unemployment:

> It is suggested that the variables underlying adaptation include the social support system in which the person is embedded, including the support he perceives as coming from peers, family and community, and his past experience of success and failure, mainly at school.

In terms of the actual results of this study, Clarke and Clissold (1982:81) report that: "Social support emerged as the most powerful single predictor of adaptation" (cf. also related research by Gore, 1978). Clarke and Clissold (1982) emphasize social-moral support.

Greenberg (1979), in his neo-Marxist extension of social control theory,[10] however, emphasizes the importance of economic support from parents and the ability of youth to maintain peer-group consumptive relations as also conditioning the labour market integration — delinquency/crime relationship. [11]

West (1984:216) similarly notes the importance of familial economic supports as mediating the labour market integration-crime relationship. However, whereas Greenberg (1979) focused upon unemployment, West (1984) expands the issue by arguing that even when many youths do get jobs they are still disadvantaged in that their rate of pay is usually quite low. West (1984:216) then emphasizes the role of the family for poorly employed youths, as he states "they consequently must rely to an unusual extent on alternative sources of income, for example, parents or theft."

Thus, this research emphasizes the importance of including a wide range of measures of labour market success and social/economic supports in any analysis of youth's involvement in crime. This may be particularly important when considering the out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts. Dropouts (see footnote 12) are no longer part of the regular school system and are quite disadvantaged by current structural constrictions in the labour market. Therefore, peer group interaction, especially keeping up with the 'young Jones', and familial relations may be central factors conditioning the labour market-crime relationship for dropouts. In summation, it is imperative to include (a) complex measures of the labour market success of the individual, and (b) the interaction of the individual with, and supports provided/withheld by family, peers, friends, and so on, in any attempt to ascertain the criminogenic impact of poor labour market integration for dropouts.

---

[10] In the now generally unfashionable orthodox Marxian theory of historical materialism, crime is held to ultimately wither away under Communism. Little effort has therefore been spent by Marxist writers to explain the genesis of crime at the individual level (cf. Radzinowicz, 1968:18, on orthodox Marxist views of crime). With the emergence of neo-Marxian based writings by Greenberg (1977), Colvin and Pauly (1984), Clarke (1985), and West (1984), this aversion to individual level analyses of primary deviation is no longer the case.

[11] See also Hirschi (1969:230) on the need to extend control theory to take account of peer relations, as well as "what delinquency does for the adolescent."

Extending Social Control Theory: The Centrality of Labour Market Integration

The final task in this discussion is to demonstrate that social control theory can quite logically be expanded to include out-of-school sources of variation in social controls, in particular, labour market based variation. Although not the central focus, out-of-school social control factors are not totally ignored or irrelevant to Hirschi's (1969) statement on the causes of delinquency. Let us outline the basis for arguing the importance of labour market integration to a social control analysis of the causes of criminal behavior, as well as the reasons why Hirschi (1969) did not focus upon such as a source of variation in social controls.

The centrality of labour market integration for a control analysis of the out-of-school causes of crime is indicated by Thornberry and Christenson (1984). These authors are in close agreement with most other criminological researchers when they state that the hypothesis that labour market integration, in this case unemployment, influences criminal involvement is easily derived from a consideration of the logic of the control theory elements of commitment and involvement. As Thornberry and Christenson (1984:400) note:

> Commitment, the "rational component in conformity," reduces criminal involvement by increasing the costs associated with deviance. As individuals invest time and energy in conventional activities, criminal behavior is avoided so as not to jeopardize investments already made. Involvement, the behavioral counterpart of commitment, posits that persons "engrossed" in conventional activity cannot, at the same time, devote considerable effort to unconventional or deviant behavior. The assumption, widely shared, is that a person may be simply too busy doing conventional things to find time to engage in deviant behavior. Since employment is clearly the predominant form of conventional activity for adult males, the hypothesis that unemployment should increase criminal behavior is explicitly developed within a control model.

Labour market integration is, moreover, explicitly stated by Hirschi (1969) to be one of the most significant factors determining the strength of an individual's bond to society. To quote Hirschi (1969:188) on the relationship between employment and crime:

> In control theories, the end of the trail for delinquency is usually marked by the point at which the person marries or goes to work.

Indeed, Hirschi (1969:188) here even goes so far as to repeat the earlier views of Tunley (1962:258) that:

> ... if I were forced to select a single approach that struck me in my travels as coming closer to the whole solution [to the problem of delinquency] than any other, it could be summed up in the four letter word [work].

In social control theory a primary controlling agent is apparently successful labour market integration. However, Hirschi (1969) does not proceed to elaborate how variation in out-of-school labour market success may affect social controls on delinquency/criminal behavior.

First, as Downes and Rock (1982:189) note, "Much of The Causes of Delinquency is taken up with testing a variety of propositions derived from subcultural theory (in both its 'strain' and 'cultural deviance' forms), and finding them wanting." Hirschi's (1969) theoretical/empirical effort was particularly directed towards providing a better analysis of the causes of delinquency than the then relatively current in-school based strain theories of Cloward and Ohlin (1960) and Cohen (1955). Concommitant with this focus, not to mention relatively easy access to subjects, Hirschi (1969) also chose to develop and test his social control theory on in-school adolescents. One major consequence of this research focus is that out-of-school causes of delinquency, and indeed adult crime, receive little attention.

Second, Hirschi (1969) had particularly little reason to consider the negative impact that poor out-of-school labour market integration would have upon youths' maturation out of crime. As noted previously, the employment prospects of youths, including the educationally disadvantaged dropouts, were relatively good in the 1960's to mid 1970's (cf. Canadian Ministry for Youth, 1984:38; Current Population Reports, 1978; and I.S.R., 1978, respectively). There was thus little opportunity to measure labour market success as a central "variable" in maturation out of criminal involvement.

> The concept of commitment assumes that the organization of society is such that the interests of most persons would be endangered if they were to engage in criminal acts. Most people, simply by the process of living in an organized society, acquire goods, reputations, prospects that they do not want to risk losing. These accumulations are society's insurance that they will abide by the rules ... Most lines of action in a society are of course conventional. The clearest examples are educational and occupational careers. (emphasis added)
>
> (Hirschi, 1969:21)

Given the theoretical/empirical task and labour market reality facing Hirschi (1969), it is perhaps understandable how little, if any, attempt was made to develop out-of-school labour market based measures of social controls and/or to relate these measures to involvement in criminal behavior. However, based upon the previous critique of the empirical adequacy of control theory, and the discussion of the drastically changing labour market prospects for youth, particularly dropouts, it is clear that this lack of attention to out-of-school social controls must now be rectified.

Let us conclude the present discussion of social control theory with an important general comment on the criminological significance of an out-of-school labour market focused extension of this theory. Social control theory as formulated by Hirschi (1969) is basically an individualistic social-psychological statement of what happens when an individual's bond to society is weak or broken. However, Box (1981:150) and West (1984:98) both maintain that a truly adequate sociological theory of the cause of delinquency/crime should also explain the external-social basis for variation in the strength of social bonds.

As Krohn and Massey (1980:536) note, Hirschi (1969) was, based upon his results, forced to recognize the need to complement social bonding theory with variables indicating deviance producing motivation. Hirschi (1969:231) focused specifically upon the need to extend social control theory to take greater account of delinquent companions, as well as what delinquency does for the adolescent. Downes and Rock (1982:190) note that Box (1981) has also attempted to increase social control theory's ability to explain motivation to delinquency by incorporating labelling/phenomenological concepts into social control theory.

However, Box (1981) also states that one particular issue which social control theory has been criticized for basically avoiding is that of structural sources of variation in social controls. Box (1981:150) notes:

> Control theory has a tendency to slip into situational subjective explanations of delinquency and thus allow the adolescent to drift away from his/her social structural and historical moorings. In that sense, it may be decontextualizing delinquency so much that it becomes dissociated from its sociological roots....

However, citing the existence of the British 'second wave' of youth culture research, Box (1981:150) also states:

> This is not to argue that the situational subjective, possibly ethnographic, view has to be dropped, but rather that it has to be supplemented, as it is in, say, Corrigan's (1979) or Willis' (1977) attempt to relate the experiences and behavior of being lower-class in contemporary Britain to a broader macro-structural and historical context.

Two recent major reviews of the adequacy of criminological theory by Greenberg (1979) and Elliot et al. (1979) have emphasized the need to incorporate/integrate structural elements into control theory. There has, however, been virtually no empirical research on structural sources of variation in social controls. The extension of social control theory via an analysis of the relationship between labour market-based measures of social controls and delinquency/crime, is thus a first, but significant, step towards producing a social control theory which does explicitly admit and test for structural sources of variation in labour market success.

Two final quotes are appropriate. Hills and Reubens (1984:308) state that the structure of the labour market is a primary determinant of youth's employment prospects and future: "Successful young men move into stable primary jobs after a lengthy 'moratorium' period of weak labour market attachment and they also adopt behavioral patterns that indicate 'settling down' ... Overall, their job mobility is heavily influenced by the structure of labour market opportunity, access to contacts, and chance" (cf. also Osterman, 1980). Hirschi (1969:185), on the other hand, states in his concluding comments on commitment to conventional society that:

> Aspirations and expectations without foundation are probably much like belief in a life after death. There may be logical or theological links between these imagined future states and present behavior, but these links are often too weak to withstand the demands of everyday life.

In summary, it is this author's view that there are several substantial sociological and social benefits to a social control theory which does recognize external-structural, as well as internal-individual, sources of variation in an individual's bond to conventional society. Not only is such a theory apparently more accurate empirically and complete theoretically, but it is also more humanitarian as it avoids the currently very insidious phenomenon of blaming the

victim of recession-caused labour market restrictions.

To conclude the present discussion, the following research is necessary because of: (i) the failure of previous empirical research to specify what happens when dropouts do not achieve relatively successful labour market integration; (ii) the necessity of expanding social control theory generally, but particularly when considering the controversy over dropout's criminal activity, to include labour market based variation in social bonding, especially for the elements of commitment and involvement; and (iii) the theoretical and social policy importance of evaluating external-structural sources of variation in an individual's bond to society.

It is necessary to develop out-of-school labour market-based measures of social controls which reflect external-structural variation in a youth's ability to be "committed to" and "involved in" conventional society; and (b) to then relate these measures of social bonding/control to dropout's involvement in relatively serious out-of-school criminal behavior. This empirical evaluation of the relationship between labour market based measures of social bonding and involvement in criminal behavior for a sample of dropouts, while obviously not establishing a causal connection between structural social disabilities and crime, should nonetheless be a valuable first step in that direction.

C. Research Questions

Given the empirical and theoretical concerns just outlined, three specific research questions can be specified.

(1a) To what extent is poor out-of-school labour market integration among dropouts related to their out-of-school involvement in crime, alcohol and drug use.

(1b) To what extent does the relationship specified in (1a) vary for different measures of crime, alcohol and drug use, as well as labour market integration.

(2) To what extent are there significant differences in the out-of-school labour market integration and crime relationship for (i) for males versus females, and (ii) older versus younger dropouts.

(3) To what extent are non-labour market out-of-school social controls, in the lives of dropouts related, either by themselves or in conjunction with poor labour market integration, to out-of-school involvement in crime. Potentially important variables here are peer/family support, marital status, familial socioeconomic status (SES), and the ability to maintain peer group relations.

II. Sampling, Measurement and Data Analysis

A. The Sample

Data on 162 school dropouts, between the ages of 15-27, have recently been collected in Edmonton as part of a large scale study of youth employment and unemployment. [12] The initial sampling design was based on a quota method by which a non-random sample of approximately 200 youth, half male and half female, between the ages of 15 to 24, who were early school leavers, was to be drawn. The procedure was to make contacts through and gather referrals from youth-oriented agencies, school counsellors, and respondents themselves. The snowball sampling technique, however, proved to be less advantageous as a source than initially expected. As a result, referrals were found through other personal kinds of contacts, and by approaching employers and employed youth. The criteria used for selection and the sources used are outlined below.

The aim was to interview representatives of as many different elements within the youthful drop-out population as possible. The immediate obstacle, however, was that no accurate method was available to define the total population of youth drop-outs. [13] The strategy, then, was to create a diverse sample of the youthful drop-out population. To cover

---

[12] Dropouts here were defined as youths who had quit the regular school system and had currently not returned to it. Some youths were, however, enrolled in upgrading programs, and in manpower sponsored job clubs. Some sample members were currently incarcerated and attending classes in that institution. The major project consisted of an approximately three year longitudinal study of youth employment and unemployment. In the spring of 1985 approximately 1300 graduating university students and 2200 graduating high school students in Edmonton, Toronto and Sudbury were administered questionnaires, by mail and in person, respectively. These questionnaires sought information on a range of topics from current employment aspirations to mental health, crime and deviant behavior. Respondents completed questionnaires again in the spring of 1986 and 1987. This longitudinal study is just ending, and hopefully will determine the impact that varying patterns and degrees of successful labour market integration has on a wide range of attitudes and behavior, one major one being crime/deviance.

[13] Lists of dropouts from local high schools proved to be so inaccurate (i.e. some students had moved, shifted schools, and/or simply could not be contacted) that this method did not allow for random sampling. Such lists were utilized to locate part of the sample, twenty-seven respondents.

the range of young drop-outs, a number of distinctive categories within that broadly defined population were identified.

The most obvious distinctions used were between those youths with jobs and those without, and between males and females. The initial intent in this Youth Employment and Unemployment study was to over sample unemployed respondents. Whereas dropouts generally had an unemployment rate in the thirty to forty percent range, and possibly as high as fifty percent according to some studies, the intent was to obtain up to 75 percent of unemployed respondents in the sample. The reason for this was that one of the primary questions in the major study was what dropouts would do when they did not have jobs in the then current economic recession. This attempted oversampling was not deemed to be problematic as the non-random design meant that the sample would not be completely representative anyway.

Another important distinction was based on those individuals who had some sort of involvement with youth-oriented agencies, and those who had no such connection. One must note here that the sampling strategy was specifically designed so as to sample some youth with delinquent/criminal histories i.e. correctional center and probation referrals in particular. On the other hand, the sampling schedule was also set up to avoid the interviewing of only deviant and/or psychologically/economically distressed dropouts.

In the end the sample had a fifty/fifty split both of males and females as well as unemployed and employed respondents. In terms of agency versus non-agency respondent split, the following was obtained. There were ninety referrals from youth oriented agencies, namely: a psychological counselling agency (N=17), two job counselling agencies (N=23), a correctional center (N=10), a provincial probation service (N=5), three educational institutes providing upgrading to students without a high school diploma (N=20), and an emergency youth shelter (N=15). Seventy non-agency contact youth were located via lists of recent dropouts from local high schools (N=27) and referrals from other interviewees/personal contacts (N=43). Many respondents in the last category were obtained by canvassing places of employment (e.g. restaurants, small retail stores, and carwashes)

which previous research indicated as likely to hire dropouts. (cf. the Edmonton Public Schools Board Study, 1983). As is obvious, there were a large number of agency referred dropouts in the sample. Given the broad definition of "agency", and given that dropouts are often involved with agencies of control, redirection and correction, this agency-referred over representation should not be problematic.

In the end, the sample totaled 168. However, from this group three interviews had incompleted questionnaires, and three interviews were unusable due to problems in taping the interview. The final sample size for analysis, therefore, was 162. In general terms, these sampled youth appear to cover the diversity within the dropout population.

B. Data Collection

Following the initial referral each interviewer [14] established contact with the potential respondent, primarily by telephone (although some contacts were made on the street in person). This initial contact was used to explain the purpose of the study, to ensure confidentiality and anonymity, and to invite the young person to participate in the study (a time, date, and place for the interview was generally established at this point). If the contact was made in person, the respondent received a one-page summary sheet describing the study (this sheet was also given at the time of the interview).

Before the interview commenced, the potential respondent was told about the study, that they need not answer all the questions asked, and that the interview would be taped. Informed consent was therefore ensured before the interview proceeded. Each dropout then went through a taped semi-structured interview conducted by a member of the research team

[14]There were a total of eight interviewers. The majority of these individuals were involved in the design and implementation of the study. They were thus quite familiar with the interview schedule (see Appendix I and II) and aware of potential problems in conducting this type of research. The remaining interviewers were hired later and put through an orientation and training session prior to going into the field. On several occasions interviewers got together to compare interview techniques, results and problems, if any problems arose. Admitting differences in interviewer style and depth of information obtained on various issues, the end result was a reasonably consistent and well run series of interviews.

which lasted approximately one hour.[15] At the end of this interview each respondent was asked to complete a mini-questionnaire which repeated a few of the individual background and labour market questions covered verbally in the main interview. [16] More importantly, however, the mini-questionnaire contained questions on issues such as involvement in criminal behavior, as well as drug and alcohol use. While attuned to the problem of sensitivity of information, the primary thrust here was to obtain fairly standardized data on involvement in crime.

After its completion, the interview tape and questionnaire were placed in an envelope and delivered to the field supervisor. To ensure complete anonymity, all records of names were destroyed. The tape and questionnaire were only identified by number, male/female, employed/unemployed, and referral/contact source.

Because of concerns that questions about unemployment, family problems, and so on might be distressing for respondents, a referral list of relevant social service agencies (and a set of rules and tips to be used as a guide during the interview) was available to interviewers who could provide the list to the respondent if it was warranted. However, despite the sensitivity of certain issues, the interviews proceeded smoothly and recourse to the referral list was not necessary. Indeed, respondents were generally quite prepared to talk about their experiences in a forthright manner. Moreover, all interviews were conducted in public places (such as libraries, coffee shops, shopping malls), except for a few which took place at the respondent's home on their request. As well, male interviewers interviewed male respondents and similarly for females. Certain spontaneously-generated interviews necessitated mixed situations, but no problems were encountered.

This was the basic data collection method in the Edmonton Youth Employment Dropout Study. However, this pool of information went through a second stage of processing. Here we hired and trained coders to transform much of the interview data into a quantified format. This was a somewhat unusual research step, which blends data collection and

[15] See Appendix I.
[16] See Appendix II.

analysis, and it requires some discussion.

Given that virtually all of the data on out-of-school social controls, as opposed to the deviance measures, were gathered via in-person interviews, these data were basically qualitative. The fact that coders read the transcripts and coded much of the information into variables with fixed response categories, amenable to computer analysis, does not, as some might suggest, significantly alter the original data. For example, reading all one hundred and sixty-two transcripts is the traditional qualitative method to ascertain how well respondents got along with parents. One might then separate out high and low crime respondent interviews to see if there were any consistent commonalities/differences between these respondents on this family attachment dimension.

In our case several coders extracted this information from a reading of the whole transcript just as in the traditional qualitative example. However, rather than keeping this information in one's head or in writen notes, the information was recorded as a frequency count in one of the categories for that variable. It is essential to state that the response categories set for the variables were established only after reading a number of the transcripts and closely examining the range of responses given by respondents to the various questions. In large part this was a form of theme reduction, albeit ultimately quantified, which is a core component of qualitative research.

We must add that this coding of qualitative data was particularly necessary given that we were working with a much larger number of subjects than is customary in qualitative research. The codification and computer storage of the data in many respects made the data more amenable to analysis than would have been the case if we had simply employed the traditional qualitative data analysis methods. The validity of undertaking this blend of data analysis has been well stated by Wallace (1987), in her recent study of youth (un)employment in Britain. As she notes:

> Many studies of young people have tended to favour qualitative approaches, seeking to understand the subjective experiences of people being interviewed. ... However, this assumes that samples are fairly small and makes it difficult to generalize trends. In this research I attempted to combine this kind of approach, which involves participant observation and lengthy in-depth interviews, with more quantitative survey data. Thus, qualitatively derived insights could be tested against the larger

> sample, whilst excerpts from interviews and research situations could be fitted into a framework of general trends.
>
> A quantitative presentation of findings can also be valuable when collecting longitudinal [or cross sectional] data over a spread of people and social groups. This is not necessarily a less empathetic method. Indeed, it is arguable that people's experience can be de-contextualized, fragmented, and reified as much by isolated quotations as by numbers.

The inclusion of a qualitative analysis of the dynamics of the out-of-school social control of crime process, in chapter seven, should appease those still skeptical of the codification and statistical analysis of the primarily qualitative data.

Measuring Crime, Drug and Alcohol Use

Information on a number of measures of criminal involvement was obtained via the self report mini-questionnaire. [17] Dropouts were asked whether in the past year, they had been questioned by the police as a suspect about some crime, and whether they had been convicted of some crime other than a traffic violation, in court. Dropouts were also asked how many times in the past year they had committed one, or more, of a range of crimes; specifically had they[18]:

(i) - broken into a building or a car? p

(ii) - taken something from a store without paying for it? p

(iii) - sold marijuana or other non-prescription drugs? n

(iv) - used physical force (like twisting an arm or choking) to get money or things from another person? v

(v) - attacked someone with a weapon or your fists, injuring them so badly they probably needed a doctor? v

(vi) - got into a fight with someone just for the hell of it? v

(vii) - damaged or destroyed on purpose, property that did not belong to you? p

(viii) - other than from a store, taken something worth less than $50 which did not

---

[17] Many of these crime measures were selected directly, or constructed, from measures utilized in previous criminological research. For example see Johnson (1979) and Hindelang, Hirschi and Weiss (1981).

[18] p = property crime, v = violent crime, n = narcotic crime. See Canadian Crime Statistics (1984).

belong to you? P

(ix) - other than from a store, taken something worth more than $50 which did not belong to you? P

Having listed the individual crime variables, one crucial measurement issue needs attention. Hagan, Gillis and Simpson (1985:1174) note that crime is a particularly difficult "variable" to investigate as "the annual prevalence of serious delinquency in the population is less than 2%-3%." Given the fact that crime, particularly relatively serious crime, is statistically a rare event, two primary concerns arise. One, can we construct summary indices of criminal behavior in order to get sufficient variation for analysis. Two, the problem of skewness arises, for while most people report little crime, a few report a lot.

Let us consider the issue of crime measurement in light of these two concerns. Given the interval nature of the crime data and the fact that virtually all subjects provided this information via the mini-questionnaire, developing indices of involvement in criminal behavior was quite feasible. We thus present summary indices of dropouts' involvement in (i) all the specific crimes listed previously, (ii) property crime and (iii) violent crime.

The first index measure, total crime, is simply an aggregation of dropouts' involvement across the range of specific offences listed previously. It is thus a summary measure of dropouts' involvement in these offences. The second measure, property crime, is more of an index proper, as is the violent crime measure, for each is created by aggregating dropouts' criminal involvement across a range of offences which have a reasonable degree of inter-correlation as well as a certain degree of face validity.[19]

---

[19]In the Pearson correlations which establish the property and violent crime indices we employ the raw individual crime frequencies. The problem of skewness in these raw crime measures exists, just as for the crime indices, which we discuss subsequently. An analysis of the correlation values using logged as opposed to raw individual crime frequencies, which reduce the problem of skew, reveals that property and violent crime measures generally had the same pattern, albeit higher, of inter-correlation. When using logged values, property crimes correlated more highly with violent crime than was the case when using raw crime measures in the index construction. However, the correlations here were not that much higher. Given this and the high degree of face validity for categorizing crime items into property and violent crime (cf. Canadian Crime Statistics, 1984), we chose to go with the separate property and violent crime indices, calculated from the raw individual crime frequencies.

As can be seen in Table 1, each of the 5 property crime variables is generally correlated with each of the other property crime variables. The mean correlation between these offences, as can also be seen in Table 1, is .3571, which while not overly strong, is reasonable. An analysis of Table 3, moreover, reveals that these property crime variables are more strongly related to each other than they are to the violent crime index variables, thereby suggesting the validity of combining them into a single index of property crime (cf. Babbie, 1986).

TABLE 1

Pearson Correlations - Property Crime Index Variables

Property Crime Variable	V1	V2	V7	V8	V9
V1 - broken into car/building	-	.3568	.3879	.3824	.5847
V2 - shoplifted	-	-	.3137	.3169	.2885
V7 - damaged property	-	-	-	.2281	.3037
V8 - theft under $50	-	-	-	-	.4032
V9 - theft over $50	-	-	-	-	-

Mean Correlation - all variables $\bar{r}x = .3571$

Table 2 presents the inter-correlations for the three violent crime variables. As can be seen, V4 and V5 are reasonably well correlated ($r = .4932$). However, variable six, got into a fight just for fun, is essentially uncorrelated with either of the other two violent crimes. [20] Given the poor correlation between V6 and the other two violent crime variables, it was deemed advisable to create a two variable violent crime index by combining V4, using physical force to get money and V5, attacking someone with a weapon. As a comparison between Table 1 and Table 2 reveals, the correlation between these two violent crime variables is also

[20]This offence is a relatively trivial one, and may be part of a sub-culture for some youth. It is also essentially unrelated to property crime variables.

greater than that between these two variables and the specific property crimes, again indicating the validity of constructing an index, this time of violent crime.

TABLE 2

Pearson Correlations - Violent Crime Index Variables

Violent Crime Variable	V4	V5	V6
V4 - used force to get things	-	.4932	.1010
V5 - attacked/injured someone	-	-	.1749
V6 - fighting for fun	-	-	-
Mean Correlation - V4, V5 and V6		$\bar{rx}$ = .2564	

TABLE 3

Pearson Correlations - Property Crime Index Variables by Violent Crime Index Variables[21]

Property Crime Variable	V4 - used force to get things	V5 - attacked/ injured someone
V1 - broken into car/building	.3704	.2810
V2 - shoplifted	.1214	.1210
V7 - damaged property	.2198	.0395
V8 - theft under $50	.2456	.2489
V9 - theft over $50	.3082	.2175
Mean Correlation	$\bar{rx}$ = .2504	$\bar{rx}$ = .1816
Mean Correlation - all variables	$\bar{rx}$ = .2173	

[21]Variable 3, sold marijuana or other drugs, is a narcotic crime and thus included only in the total crime index.

Next we must concern ourselves with the problem of skewness in the crime indices. An analysis of the raw frequency distributions for the three crime indices indicates, as expected, a high degree of skew in these measures. In order to reduce this skewness the crime index values were put through a log conversion, which significantly decreased the degree of skew. The degree of skew values as well as the mean-median split for the raw and logged crime indices are:

		skew	mean-median
Total crime	- raw	5.752	10.742 - 1.000
	- logged	1.157	0.520 - 0.301
Property crime	- raw	8.287	4.884 - 0.000
	- logged	1.745	0.315 - 0.000
Violent crime	- raw	6.023	0.710 - 0.000
	- logged	3.393	0.088 - 0.000

Next we turn to the measurement of alcohol and drug use. Data on the frequency of alcohol/drug use were obtained by asking respondents, how frequently do you: drink beer, wine or other alcohol; smoke marijuana or hash; use other non-prescription drugs? The response categories here were: everyday; several times a week; once a week; once or twice a month; less than once a month; never. Let us briefly analyse these measures in light of the problem of obtaining sufficient response frequencies for analysis, and for variable skewness.

Given that alcohol and, to a lesser extent, drug use are almost certainly more prevalent phenomena than crime, and distributed more evenly across the population, these measurement concerns should be less troublesome here. This was particularly true given that alcohol and drug use were measured on a six point scale, which reduces the problem of skew, as opposed to the open-ended interval scale for crime. The frequencies for these three variables are

Frequency	Alcohol	Cannabis	Non-prescription
never	6% (10)	32% (49)	65% (101)
> once a month	8% (12)	18% (27)	22% (35)
once/twice a month	22% (35)	12% (19)	8% (13)
once a week	43% (67)	10% (16)	3% (4)
several times per week	20% (32)	21% (33)	1% (2)
everyday	0.6% (1)	6% (10)	0.6% (1)
	(157)	(154)	(156)

As expected, an analysis of these frequency distributions reveals that alcohol use was relatively normally distributed and had sufficient cases for analysis. The cannabis and, particularly, the non-prescription drug use measures were less normally distributed and had lower frequencies of admitted substance use. The frequency of dropouts' use of non-prescription drugs, other than cannabis, was so low as to make it virtually unuseable as a separate variable. A single composite drugs variable was therefore created by combining cannabis (marijuana/hashish) and non-prescription drug use (speed, LSD, talwin and ritalin, etc.). This composite drugs variable indicated the frequency with which respondents used either cannabis or non-prescription drugs. Given the legal and social differences between alcohol and drug use, it was deemed best not to combine these variables into a single index of substance use.

In terms of the degree of skew, an analysis of the alcohol and drugs measures reveals no major skew in either the alcohol or drugs variable.[22] These measures were thus deemed adequate for analysis in their original, non-logged, form.

Measuring Out-of-School Social Controls

Information was obtained in the Youth Employment and Unemployment Dropout Study on a range of labour market and non-labour market factors which may be important in the post dropout-crime relationship (cf. Witte, 1979; and Grainger, 1981). These include current employment status; past history of (un)employment; number, duration and type of jobs held in past; type and duration of current jobs; peer group relations (including ability to maintain peer group consumptive and social activities); relations with and support from

[22]The skew values/mean-median split for alcohol and drugs were -0.750/2.650-3.000 and 0.480/2.442-2.000, respectively.

parents; and the individuals' actual financial position as well as that of the family.

Next we must consider the specific issue of obtaining valid out-of-school measures of social controls, in particular labour market based measures of the crucial bonding elements, commitment and involvement, from this pool of data on dropouts. There are two basic steps in this variable selection and/or construction process. First, we shall outline Hirschi's (1969) original views on the measurement of these social control elements. Having done this we shall then select from the dropout data set out-of-school measures of the elements of the social bond according to the following criteria.

First, was the variable a valid out-of-school measure of an element of the social bond of interest in the present study. As Bailey (1982:68) notes, establishing a 'valid' measure of variables or concepts is perhaps one of the most difficult tasks in scientific inquiry. The minimum level of validity, however, which is necessary is 'face validity'. Bailey (1982:70) states that face validity is essentially "assessed by the evaluator's studying the concept to be measured and determining, in his or her judgement, whether the instrument arrives at the concept adequately."

Second, measures obtained above were analyzed to determine whether the data for that variable in the dropout data set could be coded into categories of higher-lower social control, with sufficient response category frequencies and variation to allow that variable to be employed in the subsequent data analyses. This measurement problem arises due to the fact that we were utilizing secondary data, gathered as part of a more general study of youth (un)employment. While in many respects very fruitful, the secondary nature of the data set puts certain limitations on data analysis and necessitates methodological procedures such as this. Several examples should clarify this evaluation process.

Total income per week should be a good measure of stakes in conformity, or commitment. However, this information was obtained for only fifty-six out of the one hundred and sixty-two respondents. The problem of bias due to the high number of missing cases makes this variable unuseable for data analysis. A similar potential commitment measure, the amount of money dropouts spend per week, had sufficient cases for analysis

(one hundred and thirty). However, a type of floor effect occurred here. The amount of money that most respondents had to spend was so low that the variable could not meaningfully be coded into higher-lower social control.[23]

Finally, how often dropouts got together with their friends would appear to be a behavioral indicator of attachment to friends. An analysis of response frequencies for this variable, however, showed little variation in responses. One hundred and twenty-four out of one hundred and thirty-six respondents who answered this question (91%) reported that they got together with their friends often. There was thus insufficient variation in this measure to allow it to actually constitute a variable per se. Before moving to present Hirschi's (1969) views on measuring social controls one additional note is warranted.

In the present attempt to develop out-of-school measures of social controls the bonding element of commitment receives a great deal of attention. Thornberry and Christenson (1984) have already been quoted as stating that poor labour market integration may cause crime due to the weakening of labour market based commitment and involvement. However, the centrality of the social control element of commitment over involvement is emphasized by Krohn and Massey (1980). These authors state that the social control element of involvement may, in certain crucial respects, be subsumed under the element of commitment. [24] To quote Krohn and Massey (1980:531):

> Under the element of commitment we include the temporal dimension of involvement which Hirschi treated as a separate element. It is assumed that a person who has considerable time invested in the pursuance of conventional activities simply does not have much time left over in which to perform deviant acts. But as Conger (1976:20) pointed out, this element, connected as it is to commitment, does not have the conceptual and empirical clarity of the other elements of social bonds. While by no means impossible, it is difficult to see how individuals could be thoroughly engrossed in some activity to which they are indifferent, or how persons could be committed to an activity without considerable investment of time and energy. We assume that the temporal dimension of involvement is inextricably tied to other factors which produce commitment, making it in most respects an indicator of commitment. As such, it does not warrant treatment as a separate element of the bond.

---

[23] 74% of respondents had less than 70 dollars per week to spend and 50% had less than forty dollars.

[24] Hirschi (1969) is himself forced to conclude that in certain instances the other three elements of the social bond are perhaps generally less important than commitment in explaining crime. For example see Hirschi (1969:191).

Following Krohn and Massey (1980), in the present research the element of commitment, for which labour market based measures are constructed, shall have an "involvement in work" orientation or sub-component. A separate section concerned with measuring involvement in conventional non-labour market leisure activities will also be presented. Let us now briefly repeat the generally well known views of Hirschi (1969), as well as those of several subsequent researchers, on measuring the elements of social control theory.

Commitment

Hirschi (1969:21) conceptualized the social control element of commitment, or stakes in conformity, in the following manner:

> One is committed to conformity not only by what one <u>has</u> but also by what one <u>hopes</u> to obtain. Thus "ambition" and/or "aspiration" play an important role in producing conformity ... Most lines of action in society are of course conventional. The clearest examples are educational and occupational careers. Actions thought to jeopardize one's chances in these areas are presumably avoided. (emphasis added)

Hirschi (1969) develops his school-based social control theory by relating commitment measures of what respondents <u>hope</u> to obtain with involvement in delinquency. More specifically, he focuses upon the future educational/occupational commitment of in-school youth by measures such as:

- How much education do you expect to get? (1969:177)
- An index of general achievement orientation. (1969:179)
- The level of job desired/expected. (1969:183)

The present empirical and theoretical concern is primarily with developing a social control analysis of the out-of-school labour market-crime relationship for dropouts. Consistent with this perspective, the following items in the dropout data set would seem to be valid measures of the degree of commitment which dropouts <u>have</u> actually managed to achieve via the degree of occupation-based stakes in conformity. [25]

---

[25]Variables with more than 20% missing cases were excluded from consideration due to the obvious problem of response bias.

Labour Market Based Commitment

(i) current employment status

- full-time job	30%	(48)[26]
- part-time job	17%	(28)
- unemployed	53%	(86)
		(162)

For currently unemployed respondents:[27]

(ii) how long had respondents been currently unemployed[28]

- 1 to 6 months	58%	(39)
- 7 to 12 months	22%	(15)
- 13 or more	19%	(13)
		(67)

(iii) number of months of past unemployment

- 0 to 6 months	33%	(13)
- 7 to 12 months	45%	(18)
- 13 or more months	23%	(9)
		(40)

(iv) number of jobs since high school

- 0 to 3 jobs	68%	(50)
- 4 or more jobs	32%	(24)
		(74)

(v) how long did jobs last

- short-term (2-3 months)	53%	(35)
- short/long term	33%	(22)
- long term (over 3 months)	14%	(9)
		(66)

For currently employed respondents:

(vi) how long did jobs last

- short-term (2-3 months)	39%	(25)
- short/long term	53%	(34)
- long term (over 3 months)	9%	(5)
		(64)

[26]Response category percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

[27]Raw frequencies for variables 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 were collapsed into the categories shown for ease of presentation. These response categories were also employed in data analysis.

[28]Variable 2, how long had respondents been currently unemployed, had only 77% valid cases, slightly less than the 80% criterion noted previously. However, when combined with variable three and six, to form the composite total number of months unemployed variable, the total number of cases does reach the listed criterion. Given this fact and the centrality of the labour market measures, variable two was included in the present analysis.

(vii) number of other jobs since high school

- 0 to 3 jobs	65%	(45)
- 4 or more jobs	35%	(24)
		(69)

(viii) number of months of past unemployment

- 0 to 6 months	48%	(26)
- 7 to 12 months	31%	(17)
- 13 or more months.	20%	(11)
		(54)

Each of these labour market variables reflects a dimension, or component, of labour market success - which Hirschi (1969:21) explicitly states to be a primary source of commitment. These dimensions of labour market success, and thus commitment, focus on: (i) whether the respondents are currently employed full-time, part-time or unemployed; [29] (ii) the amount of previous unemployment; (iii) the number of jobs held, a measure of job stability, and (iv) length of jobs held, again a measure of job stability.

To summarize, individuals currently employed full-time, with little time spent unemployed and with higher job stability are higher on labour market success than respondents currently unemployed, with a lot of previous unemployment and lower job stability. The former individuals should thus be higher than the latter on occupation-based commitment.

The validity of construing these measures of labour market success as measures of social control is well indicated by Wallace (1987) in her recent study of youth (un)employment in Britain. In terms of the first two measures we may quote Wallace (1987:74) when she states:

> Those [school leavers] who were regularly employed for the entire period [1 year], ... invariably told me of their long-term goals and plans, which included buying houses and cars. Long-term life structures in terms of personal life projects were therefore available to those in regular employment, but not available to the sub-employed.

[29] Research generally shows that 60 percent of out-of-school youths working part-time would generally like full-time employment. (cf. Labour Canada, 1983:50 and Krahn, Lowe and Tanner, 1984) This should be particularly true for dropouts who are trying to establish themselves economically and socially.

In terms of the latter two measures of job stability we may reference Wallace (1987:62) when she states:

> In the Sheppy Survey, less than one-third had been in the same job continously for the entire year after leaving school ... those who remained employed were often in the most secure and rewarding jobs.

She then adds,

> Some forms of job departure were economically rational. They were means by which an individual could maximize their labour market position by finding better jobs or seeking specialized training .... However, more often than not, young people left jobs as a reaction against what they perceived to be unacceptable employment and bad conditions.

Having discussed these labour market commitment-based measures, the next task is to evaluate whether the data for these variables can be coded into higher-lower social control with sufficient response category frequencies and variation to allow that variable to be employed in subsequent data analyses.

An analysis of the previous variables and response frequencies established that each of these nine variables could be employed in the subsequent data analysis. Essentially the only thing necessary was to combine the information in the dropout data set which had been recorded separately for currently unemployed and employed respondents, thus forming a single data set. The following four labour market commitment-based measures of social control are the product of this synthesis.

Labour Market Based Commitment: Final Measures

1. Current employment status - at time of interview were respondents employed full-time, part-time or unemployed? Each of these response categories were, respectively, coded high, medium and low social control. Given that this information was obtained for the whole sample, the response frequencies are the same as those listed for variable one in the list of potential commitment measures. The response frequencies from the dropout data set and levels of social control are:

· full-time employed	30% (48)	= high social control (s.c.)
· part-time employed	17% (28)	= medium s.c.
· unemployed	53% (86)	= low s.c.
	(162)	

2. Total number of months unemployed - this variable was created by combining three variables; variable three - the number of months of previous unemployment experienced by currently unemployed dropouts; variable two - the number of months of current unemployment experienced by unemployed respondents; and variable nine - the number of months of unemployment previously experienced by respondents currently employed. The response frequencies for this composite unemployment variable and levels of social control are:

· 0 to 6 months	41% (54)	= high s.c.
· 7 to 12 months	28% (37)	= medium s.c.
· 13 or more months	31% (40)	= low s.c.
	(131)	

3. Length of jobs held - As noted in the literature review, one negative dimension of youth labour market experience in a period of economic recession is youths moving from job to job with little increase in job satisfaction, pay or mobility (cf. Hackim, 1982; and Hills and Reubens, 1984). Youths thus appear to respond to low labour market success by switching jobs frequently and not by simply resigning themselves to alienating labour. The length of time that jobs are held by dropouts should thus be one indicator of greater labour market success, and of labour market based commitment.

The length of jobs held variable was created by combining the information on this labour market experience which had been presented separately for employed and unemployed dropouts (variables five and seven). The response frequencies for this composite variable from the dropout data set are:

· short-term (2-3 months)	46% (60)
· short/long-term	43% (56)
· long-term	11% (14)
	(130)

Given the low number of dropouts with only long-term jobs this variable was split into two response categories: respondents who had had only short-term jobs previously, and better labour market integrated respondents who had had at least some long-term jobs

previously. The final recoded response frequencies and levels of social control for this length of jobs held variable are:

- short/long-term	54% (70)	= high s.c.
- short-term (2-3 months)	46% (60)	= low s.c.
	(130)	

4. Number of jobs held - this variable was created by combining data on variable four - the number of jobs held previously by unemployed respondents and variable eight - the number of jobs held by currently employed respondents. [30] This variable was also deemed to be a type of job stability measure, with higher job turnover indicating lower labour market success. The raw response frequencies from the dropout data set for this composite variable are:

-	0	7%	(10)
-	1	10%	(14)
-	2	15%	(22)
-	3	25%	(36)
-	4	14%	(20)
-	5	10%	(14)
-	6	9%	(13)
-	7 - 9	4%	(7)
-	10 - 19	2%	(5)
-	20+	3%	(2)
			(143)

Given this distribution of number of jobs held, splitting the sample into dropouts with 1 to 3 jobs held and 4 or more jobs held would provide a two category job stability variable with sufficient cases for data analysis. The one trouble spot here was the 10 respondents who had not had a single job since leaving school. Given the problem of meaningfully categorizing these respondents into either high or low job stability, a conservative approach was chosen and these cases were excluded when constructing this variable. [31] The final recoded response frequencies for this number of jobs held, job stability measure of social control are:

---

[30] A better measure would perhaps have been number of jobs/months out of school worked. However, given the number of missing cases on each of the three variables necessary in this equation, the cumulative missing cases were so great as to make this variable unuseable. Rather than omitting this labour market information the cruder measure outlined above was used for analysis.

[31] These 10 cases do not show up in the length of jobs held variable, as this information was gathered only from those subjects who had had jobs previously.

- 1 to 3 jobs held 54% (72) = high s.c.
- 4 or more jobs held 46% (61) = low s.c.
(133)

General Commitment

Labour market based commitment, as just outlined, is not the only stake in conformity measure needing attention in the present research. Two other types of more general commitment measures are also important. First, it is essential to state that future educational and occupational aspirations may not be totally irrelevant factors in the lives of dropouts, particularly for those still relatively young (i.e. age 16-25). As Paternoster et. al. (1983:461) note, treating commitment as, at least in part, future oriented is particularly important for a post-high school youth population, which is still in the process of establishing many of the material commitments which could be jeopardized by criminal deviance.

Second, we have previously outlined the views of Clarke and Clissold (1982), West (1984) and Greenberg (1979). Based upon their empirical/theoretical writings we emphasized the importance of including measures of dropout's ability to maintain peer group consumptive/social relations, and the financial/moral support provided by family/peers in the present analysis. However, Hackim (1982:434) notes that income support measures, established largely since the depression of the 1930's, may also provide a social service safety set - mitigating a certain amount of the consequences of individual labour market failure (cf. Jahoda, 1981).

These measures can essentially be conceptualized as general measures of commitment, or stakes in conformity, since such socio-economic support/relations based measures of commitment reflect, to a large extent, family/social services/peer support. Including these variables, and future commitment measures, is important in order to evaluate the impact that non-labour market social controls have upon the labour market integration-crime relationship for dropouts. Let us list the potential general commitment measures available in the dropout data set.

future commitment:

(i) had respondents selected a future occupation?

- no	25%	(39)
- yes	75%	(116)
		(155)

(ii) general job desired in 5-10 years

- professional	30%	(43)
- trades (skilled)	26%	(37)
- white collar	20%	(28)
- blue collar	5%	(7)
- entertainment/sports	11%	(16)
- self-employed	8%	(11)
		(142)

(iii) would respondent get more education?

- no	6%	(9)
- maybe	24%	(37)
- yes	70%	(109)
		(155)

socio-economic supports/relations:[32]

(i) how the family helps respondents out? [33]

- they do not	14%	(18)
- talk to respondents	2%	(3)
- give advice	9%	(12)
- financial help	51%	(66)
- jobs	2%	(2)
- moral support	22%	(29)
		(130)

(ii) family financial status

- poverty level	3%	(5)
- somewhat below average	11%	(17)
- average	52%	(81)
- somewhat above average	33%	(51)
- wealthy	1%	(2)
		(162)

[32]In social control theory individuals are committed to conformity based upon what they have, their material stakes in conformity. These variables can be conceptualized as general measures of commitment because they measure how well respondents were doing materially, based upon a combination of their own labour market success and support from their family.

[33]Fifty-one percent of respondents polled reported financial support from their family. Variables 3 thru 6, which measure the respondents' socio-economic status, thus do not simply reflect the economic success of the individual in the labour market. It is for this reason that these socio-economic measures are not used as indicators of labour market success-based commitment.

(iii) were respondents getting by financially?

- no	12%	(17)
- yes	88%	(120)
		(137)

(iv) respondent's financial status

- more money than needed	7%	(10)
- enough money to get by	65%	(101)
- usually short of money	28%	(44)
		(155)

(v) had respondents cut back on anything?

- no	31%	(44)
- food/expensive food	4%	(6)
- clothes	6%	(9)
- shelter	1%	(1)
- nice clothes	6%	(8)
- nice apartment	1%	(1)
- entertainment	18%	(26)
- socializing/going out	15%	(21)
- car	4%	(6)
- tobacco/alcohol/drugs	11%	(16)
- books/magazines	0%	(0)
- other	3%	(4)
		(142)

(vi) amount respondents spent per week (dollars)

- 0 to 10	18%	(24)
- 11 to 20	18%	(24)
- 21 to 30	8%	(10)
- 31 to 40	9%	(12)
- 41 to 50	15%	(19)
- 51 to 60	5%	(7)
- 61 to 90	5%	(6)
- 91 to 400	10%	(14)
- 101 to 110	0%	(0)
- 111 to 120	0%	(1)
- 121 to 400	3%	(4)
- 401 to 996	12%	(16)
		(130)

The next step is to analyze these two latter sets of commitment variables according to the criteria listed previously, to ascertain which variables were amenable to analysis in the present out-of-school extension of social control theory. Before moving to this analysis one note is crucial. Due to problems of low cell sizes in the ANOVA analyses which looked at the interaction between labour market and non-labour market based social controls, all non-labour market social controls had to be coded into the minimum high-low split.

Of the three future commitment variables, two are useable in the present study. Variable one is used as is. Variable three is used if respondents who said no and maybe to the question would they get more education, are grouped together and compared with respondents who said yes to this question. Comparing respondents on this basis was deemed valid. For variable two, the general job desired by dropouts in 5-10 years, one coding option was to split the variable into professional and white collar versus trades and blue collar, thereby producing a higher-lower commitment measure [34] (cf. Hirschi, 1969:183, on level of job expected as measuring commitment). However, a problem arises when one has to incorporate the entertainment/sports and self-employed response categories into one of these two high-low options. There is no meaningful, as opposed to arbitrary, way that this decision can be made, and without these twenty-seven cases the overall number of cases fall below the 80% valid cases for analysis criterion noted previously. This variable was thus not useable. Variables one and three were satisfactory future commitment measures.

The socio-economic supports/relations commitment variables are much more problematic than the future commitment measures. Indeed, in terms of measurement these are the most problematic variables in the present study. Out of the six variables only one is actually useful. Let us move briefly down the list of variables noting the basic problem with each one. Variable one, how the family helps the respondent out, is potentially a good family support measure of commitment. The only logical two way split here would have to be: "they do not" versus all forms of help summed. However, this essentially creates a non-variable as there are only 18 out of 130 cases where the family does not help the respondent out at all. This variable was thus unusable.

Variable two is family financial status. Here the problem largely centers on what to do with the average financial status respondents. Lumping the large block of average respondents with below average and poverty level respondents would produce the only employable two way split based upon cell frequencies. However, conceptually this is unjustifiable given the, at least presumed, differences in potential family support from poverty level/below average

[34]This split was also problematic as certain trades pay better than many white-collar jobs.

families as opposed to average families. Given this problem this variable was deemed unusable. Variable three was: were respondents getting by. As can be seen, with one hundred and twenty out of one hundred and thirty seven respondents saying yes to this question there was insufficient variation in this variable to employ it in the present study.

The fourth variable, respondent's financial status was, however, amenable to analysis. Here respondents with more money than they needed and enough money to get by could be grouped together (N=111) and compared with respondents who were usually short of money (N=44). This variable was thus amenable to analysis. Variable five was: had respondents had to cut back on anything. A similar problem arose here as with variable one. Given the necessary high-low split, the only option here would be to lump individuals who reported cutting back on anything and compare them with respondents reporting no cutbacks. However, a measurement problem arises when one equates cutting back on basic necessities such as food/shelter with expensive food, nice clothes and tobacco/alcohol/drugs. A second problem arises when one considers that the respondent may have already been living on very little, and thus may have answered no to this question. Given these problems this variable was also deemed to be unusable.

The amount of money respondents spent per week, variable seven, has already been indicated as unuseable in the present study due to a type of floor effect in this variable. Few respondents could realistically be said to be high enough on this variable to constitute a high social control group. The end result of this second stage of variable evaluation and construction was that only the following three measures of non-labour market commitment were found to be employable in the present study.

General Commitment: Final Measures

Future commitment and socio-economic supports/relations.

(i) Had respondents selected a future occupation?

- no 25% (39) = low s.c.
- yes 75% (116) = high s.c.

(155)

(ii) Would respondents get more education?
- no 30% (46) = low s.c.
- yes 70% (109) = high s.c.
(155)

(iii) Respondent's financial status.[35]
- more/enough money 72% (111) = high s.c.
- usually short of money 28% (44) = low s.c.
(155)

Involvement

With respect to the social control element of involvement Hirschi (1969:187) states that:

> Of the elements of the bond to conventional society, involvement in conventional activities is most obviously relevant to delinquent behavior. The child playing ping-pong, swimming in the community pool, or doing his homework is not committing delinquency.

The logic of social control theory is that as the degree of involvement in conventional activity goes up the likelihood of involvement in deviant behavior goes down. In large part this is a time-at-risk measure of social control. As conventional involvement goes up the individual has less time for involvement in deviant behavior. However, as Hirschi (1969:191) notes, individuals involved in conventional activity are also likely to have greater attitudinal commitment to conventional, non-deviant, behavior. Involvement in conventional activity would thus seem to reduce the risk of involvement in deviance on both of these planes.

Hirschi's (1969:191) primary measure of in-school involvement in conventional activities is - time devoted to homework. In addition to this Hirschi (1969:259) also measures respondent's engagement in a range of leisure activities, such as reading, sports, talking with friends, hobbies and membership in youth clubs. In terms of results obtained, Hirschi (1969:191) finds that delinquency apparently varies negatively with school related involvement, as measured by time devoted to homework. However, he basically finds no

[35] This was not conceptualized as a measure of relative deprivation, but as a measure of social control, consistent with Hirschi's statement that one is committed to conformity by what one has. In a society such as ours, how much money one has is a major determinant of "what one has".

relationship between involvement in other conventional leisure activities and crime.[36]

Measures of involvement in conventional leisure activity, very much like the in-school measures of Hirschi (1969), exist in the dropout data set. With such measures we can investigate the extent to which involvement in such activities may be important social control factors for out-of-school dropouts. Such activities may in fact be more important for out-of-school dropouts, as they are generally no longer subject, even minimally, to involvement in school related activities. Moreover, one advantage of the present dropout data set is that a fairly extensive amount of qualitative/quantitative information on the impact of poor labour market integration upon involvement in conventional activities exists.[37] This uncoded qualitative information may provide valuable insights into how poor labour market integration (i.e. low commitment) may combine with involvement in conventional activity, thereby affecting criminal activity. Having made the above points, the following six face valid measures of the out-of-school involvement of dropouts are available in the dropout data set.

---

[36] Hirschi (1969:191) considers this apparent lack of a relationship and states that one must "avoid the idea that doing 'something' - anything - is better than, that is inhibitive of, the commission of delinquent acts." Hirschi (1969:191) states directly after this that "analysis of involvement in conventional activities will thus parallel previous analysis of attitudinal commitment to conventional success goals. Such activities are presumably in large part consequences of such commitment." Again, it may thus be important to evaluate the relationship between labour market based commitment and involvement in conventional activities when analyzing involvement in crime.

[37] See V144, Discussion of changed activities, yes = 47.5% (N=75).

(i) Primary leisure time activity

1 - hobbies/crafts	8% (12)
2 - sports	9% (14)
3 - go to movies	3% (5)
4 - partying	4% (6)
5 - drinking/drugs	3% (5)
6 - visit with friends	17% (26)
7 - visit with family	2% (3)
8 - play pool	1% (1)
9 - volunteer work	1% (1)
10 - housework/children	12% (18)
11 - exercise	2% (3)
50 - sit/hand around home	12% (18)
51 - go to mall	2% (3)
52 - watch TV	9% (14)
53 - listen to music	5% (7)
54 - read	5% (8)
55 - up-grade education	6% (9)
	(153)

(ii) Did respondents belong to groups/clubs?

- no	80% (121)
- yes	20% (30)
	(151)

(iii) Did respondents participate in sports?

- no	42% (61)
- yes	58% (83)
	(144)

(iv) Did respondents have hobbies?

- no	40% (55)
- yes	60% (82)
	(137)

(v) Did respondents do any volunteer work?[38]

- no	67% (99)
- yes	30% (45)
- yes, court enforced	3% (4)
	(148)

[38]The small number of respondents (4) who reported that they did court enforced community work were excluded from analyses.

(vi) Primary things respondents did with friends?

- party	20% (27)
- talk/visit	25% (34)
- TV/movies/music	12% (16)
- games/hobbies	7% (9)
- sports	7% (9)
- bar/drugs	14% (19)
- nothing/malls	16% (21)
	(135)

The second stage analysis of these six potential measures of involvement in conventional non-labour market activity reveals that only variable one was unuseable. There was no way to meaningfully categorize this quite disparate set of activities into a high-low social control measure. The one option, which was considered, was to compare respondents engaged in relatively low social control behavior, such as drinking/drugs and partying, with respondents engaged in a range of more conventional behavior. However, the frequency count for this primarily unconventional behavior would be too low to make this an acceptable variable.

The next four involvement in conventional activity measures listed were amenable to analysis, with some modification. Each one of these variables can be conceptualized as a sub-component of a basic question, namely, what one did with one's spare time. A single composite conventional associations variable could thus be created by obtaining the mean value on these four related variables. Treating yes as 1 and no as 2, the frequencies for this index of conventional involvement are:

- 1.00	9% (15)
- 1.25	11% (18)
- 1.33	4% (7)
- 1.50	24% (38)
- 1.67	9% (15)
- 1.75	21% (34)
- 2.00	20% (32)
	(159)

Based upon these frequencies it was decided to split this association variable into high-low social control by dividing it at the mean values mid-point, namely up to one point five and over one point five. A value of two on this variable would indicate no involvement in any of

these conventional activities, whereas a value of one would indicate the converse.

Variable number six, primary things respondents did with friends, was deemed employable in the data analyses, with some collapsing of original response categories. Responses to this question were grouped into higher-lower social control, based upon the degree to which the activity engaged in reduced the risk of involvement in criminal behavior, the primary focus in the present study.[39] Activities categorized as higher involvement in conventional activity were; talking/visiting, watching T.V./movies or listening to music, games/hobbies and sports. Activities categorized as less likely to reduce risk of involvement in criminal behavior were; partying, going to bars/doing drugs, and doing nothing/hanging around malls.

To summarize this section, two involvement in conventional non-labour market activity variables were constructed for use in the present study. The variables are:

Involvement: Final Measures

(i) conventional associations

- high - mean values 1.0 to 1.5 — 49% (78) = high s.c.
- low - mean values 1.67 to 2.00 — 51% (81) = low s.c.
(159)

(ii) primary things done with friends

- talk/visit, TV/movies, games/hobbies and sports — 50% (68) = high s.c.
- party, bar/drugs, nothing/malls — 50% (67) = low s.c.
(135)

Attachment

Hirschi (1969:83) states that control theory assumes that the bond of affection for conventional persons is a major deterrent to crime. In his in-school based theory Hirschi (1969) evaluates attachment to three primary conventional groups, parents, teachers and non-delinquent peers. In addition to this, Hirschi (1969) evaluates the relationship between

[39] Relating this variable to drug use is somewhat problematic and tautological given that partying and drug use are used as indicators of lower social control.

delinquency involvement and attachment to delinquent peers. In terms of the present concern with developing out-of-school measures of social control, it is useful to note that Hirschi (1969:93) measures attachment to parents and peers by measures such as:

- Would you like to be the kind of person your father is? (affectional identification, 1969:92).
- An intimacy of communication index. (father/mother interaction, 1969:90).
- Would you like to be the kind of person your best friends are? (peer attachment, 1969:145).

One of the concerns in the present research is to evaluate how attachment, most notably parental attachment, may combine with labour market success to provide social controls on out-of-school delinquency/crime (cf. LaGrange and White, 1985:19; and Agnew, 1985:58). In order to do this we need measures of dropout's out-of-school attachment. In the dropout data set the following variables, which are similar in certain respects to those attachment measures employed by Hirschi (1969), are available. One must note, however, that the following measures of attachment are, to a certain extent, more behavioral than the primarily affectional/identification measures employed by Hirschi (1969).

(i) Who respondents spend time with.

- family	9%	(13)
- spouse, etc.	27%	(38)
- close friends	6%	(8)
- friend(s)	47%	(66)
- alone	8%	(11)
- varies	4%	(6)
		(142)

(ii) How respondents got along with their family.

- very well	43%	(62)
- OK	40%	(59)
- not very well	17%	(25)
		(146)

(iii) How often respondents got together with family.

- never/rarely	14%	(21)
- occasionally	12%	(17)
- often	24%	(35)
- live at home	51%	(75)
		(148)

(iv) How often respondents got together with friends.

- never/rarely	0%	(0)
- occasionally	9%	(12)
- often	91%	(124)
		(136)

(v) Who respondents turned to with problems.

- parents	24%	(34)
- other family	11%	(16)
- boyfriend/girlfriend	18%	(26)
- close friend	18%	(26)
- friends	17%	(25)
- counsellor	3%	(4)
- community agency	1%	(1)
- boss/employer/supervisor	1%	(2)
- no one	4%	(5)
- work it out by self	3%	(4)
- other	1%	(1)
		(144)

(vi) Who respondents lived with.

- two parents	32%	(50)
- one parent	23%	(35)
- other family	8%	(13)
- spouse/girlfriend	12%	(18)
- friends	15%	(23)
- alone	10%	(16)
		(155)

(vii) Were respondents supporting anyone.

- no	89%	(139)
- yes	11%	(17)
		(156)

Moving again to the second measurement evaluation stage, three out of these seven variables were unuseable in the present research. Variable three, how often respondents got together with family, was not employable: Here respondents who stated that they lived at home were the primary problem. Where could one place this large block of respondents in terms of the three other response categories? Independent of the fact that they lived at home, did they get together with their family never/rarely, occasionally or often? Simply living at home was not deemed to be sufficient reason to decide that respondents got together often with family.[40]

[40] A reading of the transcripts indicates the validity of this decision. For example,

Without this large block of respondents this variable had too few cases for analysis.

Variable four has basically the same problem as variable seven. For variable four virtually all respondents reported that they got together often with their friends (N=124), whereas for variable seven the vast majority of respondents were not supporting anyone (N=139). The problem of lack of variation thus makes these two variables non-amenable to data analysis.

Four attachment measures remained for analysis. Given this number of variables two methodological routes to data analysis exist, each with problems and limitations. On the one hand we could simply include all four separate measures of attachment in the data analysis. Yet this is cumbersome and increases the possibility of obtaining relationships between variables due to chance given the relatively large number of analyses to be done. [41] A better method would be to obtain a correlation matrix for these variables and to then combine correlated items into a single index of attachment.

Prior to doing the Pearson correlations variable one (who respondents spent time with) was coded into a four-category measure of attachment, namely: family/spouse, close friends, friends and alone.[42] In ascending order, each of these responses appeared to indicate greater primary group interaction, one dimension of which is attachment (cf. McGee, 1980:91). How respondents got along with family, variable two, was coded into a three-way higher-lower attachment split as follows: very well, o.k., not very well. Variable five, who respondents turned to with problems, was coded similarly to variable one. Who respondents turned to with problems was split into two categories, again based upon the degree of primary group interaction. The higher primary group interaction category included the following responses: parents, other family, boyfriend/girlfriend and close friends. The second somewhat

---

[40](cont'd) respondent #049 lives at home, but states of his family life: "I was supposed to be kicked out the day I turned eighteen. I nearly got kicked out the other day for a long distance phone call I didn't bother telling my folks about. I get into some pretty good screamin' fights with the old lady...".

[41]There are four labour market based measures of commitment and four measures of deviant behavior. Each non-labour market measure of social control is, in chapter seven, thus entered into sixteen analyses.

[42] The varies category (6) was eliminated from analysis.

lower primary interaction group on this dimension included; friends, a counsellor, a community agency, boss/employer/supervisor, other, no one and work it out by one self. Variable six, who respondents lived with, was coded into four levels based upon a similar primary group interaction criterion, namely: one/two parents, spouse, girl or boyfriend; other family; friends; alone.

Inter-item correlations were obtained for these four recoded attachment variables.[43] Unfortunately, only two of the measures were correlated highly enough to even be considered as an index of attachment. These two variables were: who respondents spent time with and how well respondents got along with their family. The correlation between these variables was .2614, which was not overly high.[43] However, given the problems with using four separate measures of attachment, and the fact that a multi-measure indicator is generally more reliable and superior to a single item measure, we chose to utilize this two item index of attachment.[44] The final step was to obtain attachment index frequencies and to split these values into higher-lower attachment, thereby creating the attachment measure utilized in subsequent data analyses. With lower values indicating higher attachment, the attachment index frequencies are:

- 1.00	25% (40)
- 1.50	11% (17)
- 2.00	24% (37)
- 2.50	20% (32)
- 3.00	19% (30)
- 3.50	0% (1)
	(157)

Based upon this frequency distribution, it was deemed best to create the following high-low attachment social control measure.

---

[43]Without listing the specific variables involved, the other Pearson r.values were .1742, .1551, .1584, .1612, and .2000. While a correlation of .2000 is not that much lower than .2614, we chose to go only with the latter highest correlation obtained.

[44]The attachment index values were simply the mean value of respondents' scores on these two individual attachment measures, after they had been recoded for the Pearson correlations described just previously.

Attachment: Final Measures

(i) attachment - two item index.

- 1.00 to 2.00	60% (94)	= high s.c.
- 2.50 to 3.50	40% (63)	= low s.c.
	(157)	

C. Data Analysis

The quantitative data from both the questionnaires and interviews will be examined first, in order to answer the research questions outlined previously. To reiterate briefly, the central issue here is the relationship between out-of-school labour market based measures of social control, either by themselves or in conjunction with other social controls, and dropouts' involvement in crime. Variation in the above relationship by sex, age, type of offence as well as measure of labour market integration utilized is also a major research concern.

Descriptive statistics for the sample of dropouts shall be presented in chapter three. They provide a useful in-depth summary of important characteristics of the sample prior to moving to look at associations between variables. It is particularly important to identify any major characteristics of the sample which may affect, and/or explain, the results obtained in subsequent data analysis chapters.

In chapter four we evaluate the zero-order relationships between labour market based social controls and crime and alcohol/drug use. Here we shall examine cross-tabulations investigating, for example, such questions as whether being unemployed, employed part-time or full-time is associated with involvement in crime. Due to the problem of small cell sizes, it is not possible to introduce control variables to analyze the influence of factors such as sex, age, family attachment, and so on.

In chapter five we look at variation in the labour market-crime, alcohol/drug use relationship by sex and age using two-way analysis of variance. Similarly, in chapter six we employ ANOVA to look at variation in the labour marker-crime, alcohol/drug use relationship by non-labour market social controls, namely: general commitment, involvement

and attachment.

Subsequent to this, in chapter seven, we move to a qualitative analysis of the dynamics of the out-of-school social control of crime process (cf. Glaser and Straus, 1967; and Taylor, 1983, on analyzing qualitative data). In chapter eight we present our conclusion to the present thesis. One final concern requires comment.

In this thesis, as in other research into the causes of delinquency crime, the thorny issue of whether poor labour market integration causes crime or vice versa arises (cf. Thornberry and Christenson, 1984). As Petersilia (1980:337) notes, in studies such as ours which utilize non-longitudinal data it is extremely difficult to establish causal relationships (cf. Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1983, for an opposing view). Qualitative information bearing on the respondents' perception of this issue was available as all respondents were given the option, at the end of the in-person interview, of discussing their involvement in crime. If they did disclose such involvement they were probed by the interviewer as to whether poor labour market success, usually unemployment, had any causal impact on their criminal activity.

It was not felt, however, that these limited subjective data were adequate to the task of addressing this very important, but very troublesome, question. In all likelihood there are reciprocal relations between labour market success and deviant behavior. This crucial question of causality was not the focus of the present research and we did not have the data to deal with it. Nevertheless, we procede with analyses that place labour market integration in the role of independent or causal variable.

Now that we have completed our discussion of sampling, measurement and data analysis, let us present the descriptive statistics for the sample.

III. Descriptive Statistics: Characteristics of Respondents

In this section many of the more important background characteristics of the sample of dropouts (N=162) are presented. These descriptive statistics are presented for eight sets of variables of primary concern in the present analysis of the out-of-school criminal involvement of dropouts.

A. Age and Sex

Slightly more than half of the sample was male, i.e. 82 males and 80 females. The age of the sample members ranged from 15 to 27 at the time of interview, with an average age for both male and female respondents of approximately 20 years. Approximately 52% of the sample was between 15 and 19 years of age, 39% was between 20 and 23 and approximately 8% was 23 to 26 years of age. The age distribution of males and females in the sample was approximately equal.

B. Schooling

Reasons for Dropping Out

As can be seen from Table 4, the most frequent type of primary[45] reason respondents stated for leaving school was school related (54%). The two most common specific school related reasons were 'disliked/hated school generally' (12%) and 'getting kicked out of school' (11%).

The second reason for early school leaving was personal/family/friends related (29%). The most frequent reason for dropping out of school within this general category was 'problems living at home/kicked out of the house'(15%). The third category of reasons was work/money related. The percentage of sample members in this category was fairly small (15%). This is perhaps surprising, given the common perception of dropouts as precocious

[45]The first reason stated by respondents for leaving school was deemed to be primary.

adopters of adult life styles, part of which is employment. Finally, a very small percentage of the sample (only 3%) reported in-school criminal/drug/alcohol involvement as the primary reason for early school leaving. This provides some support for treating crime/deviance as the outcome, rather than the cause of labour market sifficulties (cf. I.S.R., 1978:216).

Females were much more likely than males to report 'personal' reasons for leaving school (Table 4; 40% and 19%, respectively). There were no notable differences between older (20 to 24 yrs.) and younger (16 to 19 yrs.) dropouts in terms of the primary reason for leaving school.

TABLE 4

Respondents' Primary Reason For Leaving School

Reasons	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
School Related	54%(84)	58%(46)/49%(38)	48%(34)/59%(48)
Personal	29%(46)	19%(15)/40%(31)	32%(23)/26%(21)
Work/Money	15%(23)	19%(15)/10%(8)	17%(12)/12%(10)
Deviance	3%(4)	4%(3)/ 1%(1)	3%(2)/ 2%(2)
Total (N)	(157)	(79)/(78)	(71)/(81)

Length of Time Out of School

The mean length of time out of school for males and females was almost identical at 2.7 and 2.6 years, respectively. At the time of interview, 26% of the sample had been out of school for up to 6 months; 16% had been out of school for 7 to 12 months; 15% had been out of school for 13 to 24 months; 20% for 25 to 48 months, and 24% for between 49 and 96 months. Thus, there is quite a large range, approximately equal for males and females, in dropout's length of time out of school.

How Respondents Did in School

Twenty-five percent of the sample reported doing better than average in school, whereas 39% reported getting average grades. Only 35% of the sample reported doing poorly in school prior to dropping out. This sample of dropouts thus essentially conforms to dropouts in general, in that the vast majority appear to have the intellectual capacity to complete high school (cf. Elliot and Voss, 1974:15).

The majority of the sample members were, moreover, in the main academic stream (63%), while the remainder had been in vocational/business programs. Fifty six percent of the sample did, however, report skipping school a lot.

Highest Grade Finished in School

From Table 5 it can be seen that by far the majority of respondents left school after completing grade 9 to 11 (88%). Only 9% left after completing grade 7 or 8 and only 4% left during grade 12. Females tended to stay in school longer than males with more females making it to the higher grades before dropping out; 40% of the females but only 25% of males completed grade 11. There were two somewhat notable differences between older and younger dropouts in terms of highest grade finished in school. Younger dropouts were more likely than older (14% versus 1%) to drop out after completing only grade 8. Older respondents were, however, more likely than younger to drop out after completing grade 10 (40% versus 27%).

TABLE 5

Highest Grade Respondent Finished In School

	Total Sample		Male/Female	Older/Younger
Grade 7	1%(1)		1%(1)/ -	- / 1%(1)
Grade 8	8%(12)	31%	6%(5)/ 9%(7)	1%(1)/14%(11)
Grade 9	23%(35)		30%(23)/16%(12)	23%(17)/22%(18)
Grade 10	33%(51)		35%(27)/32%(24)	40%(29)/27%(22)
Grade 11	32%(49)	69%	25%(19)/40%(30)	32%(23)/32%(26)
Grade 12	4%(6)		4%(3)/ 4%(3)	4%(3)/ 4%(3)
Total (N)	(154)		(78)/(76)	(73)/(81)

C. Employment

Current Employment Status[4]

At the time of interview, 53% of the sample was unemployed; 30% was employed full-time and 17% of the sample had part-time jobs (Table 6). Forty three percent of females in the sample were unemployed at time of interview as compared to 63% of the males. Given the non-random nature of this sample, the gender differences in unemployment should not be generalized to the population of high school dropouts. There were no notable differences between younger and older sample members in terms of their being employed, full or part-time, or unemployed at the time of interview.

[4]See Appendix IV for descriptive statistics on the individual labour market variables, presented separately for respondents currently employed and unemployed at time of interview.

TABLE 6

Respondents' Current Employment Status

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
Employed Full-time	30%(48)	23%(19)/36%(29)	33%(25)/27%(22)
Employed Part-time	17%(28)	13%(11)/21%(17)	16%(12)/20%(16)
Unemployed	53%(86)	63%(52)/43%(34)	51%(38)/54%(44)
Total (N)	(162)	(82)/(80)	(75)/(82)

Total Number of Months Unemployed

A "total number of months of unemployment" measure was created by combining three variables; (i) months of previous unemployment experienced by currently unemployed dropouts, (ii) months of current unemployment experienced by unemployed respondents, and (iii) the total number of months of unemployment previously experienced by those respondents currently employed.

From Table 7 it can be seen that 41% of the total sample reported experiencing up to 6 months of total unemployment. Twenty-eight percent reported between 7 and 12 months of total unemployment, while 31% reported having experienced over a year of total unemployment. There were no notable differences between males and females in terms of total number of months of unemployment.

Younger dropouts, however, were approximately twice as likely as those older to report having experienced up to 6 months of total unemployment (55% and 28%, respectively). Older respondents, on the other hand, were much more likely to report having experienced over a year of total unemployment (45% and 16%, respectively). This latter pattern no doubt results, in large part, from the longer time period in the labour market for older respondents.

TABLE 7

Respondents' Total Number of Months Unemployed

Months	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
0-6 months	41%(54)	44%(31)/38%(23)	28%(18)/55%(34)
7-12 months	28%(37)	29%(20)/28%(17)	28%(18)/29%(18)
13(+) months	31%(40)	27%(19)/34%(21)	45%(29)/16%(10)
Total (N)	(131)	(70)/(61)	(65)/(62)

Length of Jobs Held

A "length of jobs held" variable was created by combining the information on this labour market experience which had been collected separately from employed and unemployed dropouts. As can be seen from Table 8, 46% of the total sample reported having had only short-term jobs (2-3 months). Fifty-four percent of the sample reported having had at least some long-term jobs since leaving school. [47]

While the male-female difference in terms of length of jobs held was not large, males were somewhat more likely to report having had only short-term jobs (51% and 40%, respectively). Conversely, females were more likely to report having had at least some long-term jobs (60% and 49%, respectively). There were major differences, however, between older and younger respondents in terms of the length of jobs held. Younger respondents were more than twice as likely as older respondents to report having had only short-term jobs (66% and 30%, respectively). Older respondents were, on the other hand, twice as likely to report having had at least some long-term jobs previously.

This greater propensity for younger respondents to report having had only short-term jobs likely results, in part, from their more limited time in the labour market than older respondents. However, it may also be due to deteriorated labour market prospects for younger

[47]A small number of respondents reported having had only long-term jobs previously. The number of cases was, however, too small to construct a third long-term jobs category for analysis.

dropouts, and indeed youth in general, which which this younger cohort would have experienced (cf. Hills and Reubens, 1984:310).

TABLE 8

Respondents' Length of Jobs Held

Length	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
Short (2-3 months)	46%(60)	51%(36)/40%(24)	30%(21)/66%(38)
Short-Long (4+ months)	54%(70)	49%(34)/60%(36)	70%(49)/35%(20)
Total (N)	(130)	(70)/(60)	(70)/(58)

Number of Jobs Held

A "number of jobs held" variable was created by combining data on the number of jobs held previously by unemployed respondents and the number of jobs held by currently employed respondents. These data are presented in Table 9. As can be seen, 54% of the sample reported having up to 3 jobs since leaving school, while 46% of the sample reported having had 4 or more jobs.

While not overly large, there were some male-female differences in terms of number of jobs held. Sixty percent of females, but only 49% of males in the sample, reported having had up to 3 jobs. Males were, conversely, more likely to report having had more jobs than females (51% and 40%, respectively, reporting 4 or more). Younger respondents were also more likely than older to report having had up to 3 jobs (67% and 41%, respectively), while older respondents reported having had a greater number of jobs than younger (59% and 33%, respectively reporting 4 or more).

TABLE 9

Respondents' Number of Jobs

Number	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
1-3 jobs	54%(72)	49%(35)/60%(37)	41%(28)/67%(43)
4(+) jobs	46%(61)	51%(36)/40%(25)	59%(40)/33%(21)
Total (N)	(133)	(71)/(62)	(68)/(64)

Type of Job Held

As with previous research on the employment of dropouts (Edmonton Public School Board, 1983), the jobs held previously by currently unemployed dropouts were primarily relatively low-paying, dead-end jobs in the sales, service and manufacturing/construction sector. While there was quite a wide range of specific jobs held within this essentially marginal work world[43], there was a significant concentration in the sales clerk/food services employment area. Thirty seven percent of currently unemployed respondents reported having worked in these areas.

Of those sample members who reported being currently employed, full or part-time, 47% (35) were employed in sales/food services. An additional 10% (7) were doing clerical work, which here included bank tellers (N=5). The rest of the sample had jobs which varied widely (cab driver, cooks helper, unskilled labour, etc.), yet each was essentially a low paying, marginal job. So there was thus little difference in the types of jobs done by currently unemployed and employed sample members.

D. General Commitment

[43]See Krahn and Lowe (1988) for an explication of labour market segmentation theory and research.

Family Financial Status

As seen from Table 10, only 14% of the dropout sample reported their family's financial status to be either somewhat below average or at the poverty level; 52% reported that their family was of average financial status, and 34% reported that their family was either somewhat above average or wealthy. There were no male-female differences in reported family financial status. Younger respondents, however, were slightly more likely than older to report having above average/wealthy families (40% and 28%, respectively). There were no major differences in the family financial status reported by sample members with full-time, part-time or no current employment.

TABLE 10

Respondents Family Financial Status

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Poverty level/ somewhat below average	14%(22)	13%(10)/14%(12)	19%(14)/10%(8)	11%(5)/11%(3)/17%(14)
Average	52%(81)	53%(41)/51%(40)	53%(40)/51%(41)	55%(26)/54%(15)/50%(40)
Somewhat above average/wealthy	34%(53)	37%(27)/33%(26)	28%(21)/40%(32)	34%(16)/36%(10)/33%(27)
Total (N)	(156)	(78)/(78)	(65)/(79)	(47)/(28)/(81)

Whom Was the Respondent Living With

Table 11 reveals that, 10% of the sample members were living alone at the time of interview; 55% were living with either one or both parents, and 35% were living with either a family member other than parents, a spouse/partner or with friends. The vast majority of respondents may thus have had access to some potentially important social supports.

There were few male-female differences in whom the respondent was living with, except that females were slightly more likely to live with a non-parent family member, spouse/partner or with friends. As we would expect, younger sample members (69%) were much more likely than older (40%)to report living with one/both parent(s). Older sample members were not more likely to live alone but were more likely (52% to 18%) to live with a non-parent family member, a spouse/partner, or with friends. There were no notable differences in whom the respondent was living with by current employment status, except that those employed full-time were less likely to be living alone.

TABLE 11

Whom Respondents Lived With

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Alone	10%(16)	11%(9)/10%(7)	8%(6)/13%(10)	4%(2)/15%(4)/13%(10)
One/both parents	55%(85)	58%(47)/51%(38)	40%(29)/69%(53)	58%(28)/52%(14)/54%(43)
Other family/ spouse*/friends	35%(54)	31%(25)/40%(29)	52%(38)/18%(14)	38%(18)/33%(9)/34%(27)
Total (N)	(155)	(81)/(74)	(73)/(77)	(48)/(27)/(80)

* Spouse includes living common-law with girl/boy friend.

Help From Family

Only 14% of the sample reported that they did not receive any help from their family; 34% of the sample reported that they received moral support/advice from their family, while 52%, the majority of the sample, reported receiving financial help/jobs from their family (Table 12). There were few differences in the family help reported by males and females, except that females were slightly more likely to report receiving moral support/advice from

their family. There were no notable differences in the family help reported by younger and older sample members. Those sample members with no current employment, however, reported much less moral support/advice from their family than those respondents with either a full or part-time job (25%, 44% and 45%, respectively).

On the other hand, sample members with less labour market success were more likely to report financial help from the family (full-time job, 44%; part-time job, 50%; and no job, 58% reported family financial help). The fact that 44% of full-time employed dropouts received financial help is fairly surprising. However, as noted previously, these dropouts were generally working in low paying, dead-end jobs and may not have been able to make ends meet economically without help.

TABLE 12

Help From Family

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
They do not	14%(18)	16%(11)/12%(7)	16%(10)/13%(8)	12%(5)/ 5%(1)/17%(12)
Advice/ moral support	34%(44)	30%(21)/38%(23)	36%(23)/32%(20)	44%(18)/45%(9)/25%(17)
Financial help	52%(68)	54%(38)/50%(30)	48%(31)/56%(35)	44%(18)/50%(10)/58%(40)
Total (N)	(130)	(70)/(60)	(64)/(63)	(41)/(20)/(69)

Respondents' Financial Status

Table 13 presents data on respondents' financial status. Very few sample respondents (7%) reported usually having more money than they needed. The majority (65%) however, reported usually having enough money to get by. A moderate percentage (28%) of sample members, nonetheless, reported that they were usually short of money.

There were no notable differences in the financial status of male and female respondents, and little difference between younger and older sample members in terms of their financial status at time of interview. Not surprisingly, those respondents currently unemployed were much more likely than either part or full-time employed respondents to report being usually short of money (38%, 22% and 15%, respectively). Still, a significant proportion of those respondents without a current job did report usually having enough money to get by (60%). Other factors, such as unemployment insurance payments and/or parental help, may be crucial for differentiating those sample members who get by economically from those who cannot.

TABLE 13

Respondents' Financial Status

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
More money than needed	7%(10)	6%(5)/ 7%(5)	8%(6)/ 5%(4)	17%(8)/ -- / 2%(2)
Enough money	65%(101)	62%(48)/69%(53)	64%(48)/66%(53)	67%(31)/78%(21)/60%(49)
Short of money	28%(44)	32%(25)/25%(19)	28%(21)/29%(23)	15%(7)/22%(6)/38%(31)
Total (N)	(155)	(78)/(77)	(75)/(80)	(46)/(27)/(82)

What Did Respondents Live On

Table 14 shows that one-half (49%) of the sample reported that they lived primarily[49] on their employment earnings;[50] 23% reported that they depended primarily on their family for their livelihood, while only 1% reported that they relied primarily upon their friends. Twenty eight percent of the sample reported that they lived primarily on social

[49]The first source of livelihood reported by respondents was deemed to be the primary source.

[50]This employment earnings category includes 5% (7) of sample respondents who reported living primarily on savings and other sources of income.

welfare, such as unemployment insurance, welfare and/or training allowances/loans.

There were no notable differences between males and females in terms of their reported primary source of livelihood. Younger sample members were, however, more likely than older to report living primarily off of their family (29% and 16%, respectively). Older respondents were more likely than younger to report living primarily on social welfare (33% and 24%, respectively).

Approximately 78% of those sample members currently employed, full and part-time, reported living primarily from their work. Alternatively, 6% of those with full-time jobs, 11% of those with part-time jobs and 36% of those with no current job reported living primarily on support from their family. Eleven percent of sample members employed part-time and 40% of those respondents with no current job reported living primarily on social welfare benefits (i.e. unemployment insurance, welfare, training allowances, etc.). However, 17% of the sample members currently employed full-time also reported living primarily on social welfare benefits, including employment training allowances.

TABLE 14

What Did Respondents Live On

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Employment earnings	49%(77)	48%(38)/51%(39)	51%(37)/47%(37)	77%(36)/78%(21)/24%(20)
Family/friends	23%(36)	21%(17)/25%(19)	16%(12)/29%(23)	6%(3)/11%(3)/36%(30)
Social welfare	28%(44)	31%(25)/25%(19)	33%(24)/24%(19)	17%(8)/11%(3)/40%(33)
Total (N)	(157)	(80)/(77)	(73)/(79)	(47)/(27)/(83)

Has the Respondent Had to Cut Back on Anything

Table 15 reveals that, 31% of the sample reported that they had not had to cut back on anything during their recent period of employment/unemployment. But 18% of the sample reported that they had to cut back on money spent on food/clothes/shelter, while 33% reported that they had cut back on socializing with friends or entertainment. A further 16% reported cut-backs on less essential things such as, a car, tobacco, drugs or alcohol.

Females were more likely than males to report having to cut back money spent on food/clothes/shelter (30% and 7%, respectively).[51] Males were, however, more likely than females to report having cut-back on (i) socializing/entertainment and (ii) on a car and tobacco/drugs/alcohol.

There were very few differences of note between younger and older respondents, except that younger respondents were more likely to report having cut back on a car and tobacco/drugs/alcohol. Sample members currently employed full-time were better off than either those respondents employed part-time or currently unemployed, as 50%, 22% and 23%, respectively, reported not having to cut-back on anything during their recent period in the labour market. Still, a full 50% of respondents currently employed full-time did report having to cut-back on what are, to some extent, basic necessities in life, such as food and socializing/entertainment, as well as owning a car.[52]

There were only minimal differences between respondents employed full-time, part-time and unemployed in terms of their reported cut-backs on (i) food/clothes/shelter and (ii) a car/tobacco/drugs/alcohol as an average of around 17% of each group reported cutting back on both. However, those respondents currently with no job or employed

---

[51]This food/clothes/shelter response category includes cut-backs on both basic and expensive food/clothes and can not strictly be viewed as some measure of "absolute poverty".

[52]We must note here that 21% (9) of respondents currently employed full-time reported recently having to cut-back on socializing/entertainment. Some part of this cut-back is likely due to the fact that, while working full-time, respondents do not have enough time, as opposed to money, to socialize/entertain. Transcripts indicate that employed respondents complained about having less time to spend with their friends after becoming employed.

part-time were much more likely than respondents employed full-time to report having to cut back on socializing/entertainment (38%, 39% and 21%, respectively).

TABLE 15

Have Respondents Had to Cut Back on Anything

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
No nothing	31%(44)	29%(22)/33%(22)	34%(23)/27%(19)	50%(21)/22%(5)/23%(18)
Food/clothes/ shelter	18%(25)	7%(5)/30%(20)	19%(13)/17%(12)	14%(6)/22%(5)/18%(14)
Socializing/ entertainment	33%(47)	39%(29)/27%(18)	33%(22)/33%(23)	21%(9)/39%(9)/38%(29)
Car/tobacco/ drugs/alcohol	18%(26)	25%(19)/10%(7)	13%(9)/23%(16)	14%(6)/17%(4)/21%(16)
Total (N)	(142)	(75)/(67)	(67)/(70)	(42)/(23)/(77)

E. Attachment

How Respondents Got Along With Family

A minority (17%) of the sample reported that they did not get along very well with their family (Table 16). The majority did, however, report either getting along OK, or getting along very well with their family (40% and 43%, respectively). There were no appreciable male-female differences in the extent to which sample members reported getting along with their family.

Older sample members were, on the other hand, more likely than younger to report getting along very well with their family and less likely to report just getting along OK with their family. Sample members currently unemployed were more likely than those employed either full-time or part-time to report not getting along very well with their family (23%

versus 12% and 8%, respectively).

Sample members currently employed part-time were most likely to report getting along OK with their family (58% versus 33% of respondents currently employed full-time and 39% of respondents unemployed). Respondents employed full-time were most likely to report getting along very well with their family, with 56% of this group doing so, as opposed to only 33% of respondents employed part-time and 38% of respondents currently unemployed. There would thus appear to be some form of positive relationship between this measure of labour market success and respondents' ability to get along with their family.

TABLE 16

How Respondents Got Along With Family

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Not very well	17%(25)	13%(10)/21%(15)	14%(9)/18%(14)	12%(5)/ 8%(2)/23%(18)
OK	40%(59)	41%(31)/39%(28)	34%(22)/46%(36)	33%(14)/58%(14)/39%(31)
Very well	43%(62)	45%(34)/39%(28)	52%(33)/36%(28)	56%(24)/33%(8)/38%(30)
Total (N)	(146)	(75)/(71)	(64)/(78)	(43)/(24)/(79)

How Often Respondents Got Together With Family

As indicated in Table 17, 29% of the sample members reported that they never/rarely got together with their family; 23% reported that they got together occasionally with their family, whereas 24% reported that they got together often with their family. [53] Male respondents were more likely than females to report never/rarely getting together with their family (36% versus 21%). Females, on the other hand, were more likely to report getting together often with their family (53% versus 44%).

While the low number of cases necessitates caution, the data in Table 17 indicate that part-time employed respondents were less likely to get together never/rarely with their family.

[53]Fifty one percent (75) of the total sample reported that they lived at home and were not included in the analysis.

Conversely they were more likely than full-time or unemployed respondents to report getting together occasionally with their family (50% versus 19% and 18%, respectively). Approximately half of the respondents in each employment category reported getting together often with their family.

TABLE 17

How Often Respondents Got Together With Family

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Never/rarely	29%(21)	36%(14)/21%(7)	31%(14)/27%(7)	33%(7)/ 8%(1)/33%(13)
Occasionally	23%(17)	21%(8)/27%(9)	20%(9)/27%(7)	19%(4)/50%(6)/18%(7)
Often	48%(35)	44%(17)/53%(18)	49%(22)/46%(12)	48%(10)/42%(5)/50%(20)
Total (N)	(73)	(34)/(39)	(45)/(26)	(21)/(12)/(40)

How Often Respondents Got Together With Friends

The vast majority of sample members (91%) reported that they got together with their friends often. Only 9% of respondents reported that they got together with their friends only occasionally. There were essentially no male-female differences, and very few age or employment status differences in terms of reported frequency of interaction with friends.

Whom Respondents Spent Time With

Only 8% of the sample members reported that they spent most of their time alone (Table 18) Thirty-six percent of respondents reported that they spent most of their time with their family/spouse, 52% of respondents reported that they spent their time mostly with friends/close friends, while 4% stated that whom they spent their time with varied.

There were no major male-female differences in whom sample members reported spending time with. However, females were slightly more likely to report spending time mostly with their family, while males were slightly more likely to report spending time mostly with

their friends/close friends (41% versus 32% and 48% versus 56%). These results conform to traditional sex-role patterns which indicate females to be more under the influence/supervision of family than males.

There were major differences between older and younger sample members in terms of whom they spent their time with. Not surprisingly, older sample members were more likely than younger to report that they spent their time with their family/spouse (54% and 19%, respectively). Younger sample members were more likely than older to report spending time primarily with friends/close friends (67% and 39%, respectively).

Currently unemployed respondents were much less likely than respondents employed either full or part-time to report spending time primarily with their family/spouse and much more likely than either of these two latter groups to report spending time primarily with their friends. If one uses this question about social interaction as a measure of potential sources of social support, it would appear that very few sample members are severely disadvantaged in this respect.

TABLE 18

Whom Respondents Spent Time With

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Alone	8%(11)	7%(5)/ 9%(6)	5%(3)/ 8%(6)	10%(4)/ - / 9%(7)
Family/spouse	36%(51)	32%(23)/41%(28)	54%(36)/19%(14)	45%(19)/44%(11)/28%(21)
Friends	52%(74)	56%(41)/48%(33)	39%(26)/67%(48)	43%(18)/40%(10)/61%(46)
Varies	4%(6)	6%(4)/ 3%(2)	3%(2)/ 6%(4)	2%(1)/16%(4)/ 1%(1)
Total (N)	(142)	(73)/(69)	(67)/(72)	(42)/(25)/(75)

Whom Respondents Turned to With Problems

From Table 19 it can be seen that relatively few respondents (only 7%) reported that they turned to no one, or worked things out by themselves, when they had problems. The

majority of sample members (54%) stated that they turned to their friends (general friends/boy-girl friends/close friends) when they have problems. A further 35% reported that they turned to parents/family when they have problems. Very few sample members reported that they turned to relatively formal sources of advice/support, such as community service agency workers or their employer when they had problems.

Males in the sample were slightly more likely than females to report that they turned to no one when they had problems. Females, on the other hand, were more likely than males to report that they turned to their friends when they had problems (60% and 47%, respectively). There were few differences between older and younger sample members, except that younger respondents were slightly more likely to report turning to relatively formal sources of help when confronted by problems. There were also no notable differences in whom respondents turned to with problems by current employment status.

TABLE 19

Whom Respondents Turned to With Problems

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
No one	6%(9)	9%(7)/ 3%(2)	8%(5)/ 4%(3)	4%(2)/ 7%(2)/ 7%(5)
Friends	54%(77)	47%(36)/60%(41)	56%(37)/51%(38)	55%(26)/57%(16)/51%(35)
Family	35%(50)	36%(27)/34%(23)	35%(23)/35%(26)	34%(16)/36%(10)/35%(24)
Employer/ Counsellor	6%(8)	8%(6)/ 3%(2)	2%(1)/10%(7)	6%(3)/ - / 7%(5)
Total (N)	(144)	(76)/(68)	(66)/(74)	(47)/(28)/(69)

Was the Respondent Supporting Anyone

Eleven percent of the sample members reported they were supporting at least one other person. Females (17%) were more likely than males (5%) to say they had a dependent. Older respondents were also more likely than younger to report supporting another person (18% and 5%, respectively). There were no notable differences by current employment status.

F. Involvement in Conventional Activities

Primary Things Respondents Did With Their Friends

Primary activities that respondents engaged in with their friends were grouped, as discussed previously, into higher and lower conventional activities. Activities included as higher conventional were talk/visit with friends, watch TV/movies, games/hobbies and sports. On the other hand, partying, going to bars, doing drugs, doing nothing and hanging out in malls were deemed much less likely than the former activities to reduce the risk of involvement in criminal behavior. These latter activities can thus be termed unconventional. Overall, the sample was split fifty-fifty in terms of primary activities engaged in with friends. Males, however, were slightly more likely than females to report that the primary things they did with their friends were unconventional (57% (39) and 42% (28), respectively). There were no notable differences by age or current employment status in the primary activities respondents engaged in with their friends.

Respondents' Membership in Clubs/Groups

An analysis of Table 20 reveals that 20% of the sample members reported that they did belong to organized clubs/groups. Males (27%) in the sample were somewhat more likely than females (13%) to report belonging to groups/clubs. There were no notable differences between older and younger sample members in this area. On the other hand, part-time employed respondents were a little less likely than either full-time employed or unemployed respondents to report involvement in organized clubs/groups.

Respondents' Participation in Sports

A much greater percentage of the sample reported participation in sports (58%) than involvement in clubs/groups (Table 20). There were essentially no differences between male-female and older-younger sample members in terms of reported involvement in sports. Part-time employed respondents were, however, more likely than either full-time employed or unemployed respondents to report participation in sports (79%, 57% and 51%, respectively).

Respondents' Involvement With Hobbies

Data in Table 20.also indicate that a large percentage (60%) of the sample reported that they had hobbies, but females (67%) were more likely than males (54%) to indicate this. There were no notable differences between older and younger sample members. However, full-time employed respondents were more likely than either part-time employed or unemployed respondents to report having hobbies (71%, 50% and 56%, respectively).

Respondents' Volunteer/Community Work

As can be seen in Table 20, a moderate percentage of the sample members (30%) reported that they did some volunteer/community work. [54] Females in the sample and older respondents were more likely than males and younger respondents, respectively, to report being voluntarily engaged in volunteer/community work. The greatest percentage differences between sample members reporting involvement in volunteer/community work, however, existed for part-time as opposed to full-time employed or unemployed respondents. Forty six percent of part-time employed but only 23% of full-time employed and 29% of unemployed respondents reported doing volunteer/community work.

[54]An additional 3% (4) of the sample, all males, reported that they had recently done volunteer/community work, but that this was prompted by a court order subsequent to a criminal conviction.

TABLE 20

Respondents Involvement in Conventional Activities

	Total Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger	Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Club Groups (V145)	20%(30)	27%(20)/13%(10)	19%(13)/22%(17)	21%(10)/15%(4)/21%(16)
Sports (V146)	58%(83)	59%(48)/56%(35)	60%(41)/56%(40)	57%(24)/79%(19)/51%(40)
Hobbies (V147)	60%(82)	54%(41)/67%(41)	64%(40)/59%(41)	71%(31)/50%(10)/56%(41)
Volunteer/ Community Work (V148)	30%(45)	25%(19)/36%(26)	36%(25)/26%(19)	23%(11)/46%(13)/29%(21)

How Activities Changed Since Respondents Became Employed/Unemployed

Of those sample members currrently employed full or part-time, 9% reported that their activities changed for the worse once they obtained their present employment and 19% reported little change in activities after finding their present job (Table 21). Just over one quarter of these respondents (28%) reported any clear improvement in their activities once they found their current job.

From Table 21 it can also be seen that 29% of the currently unemployed reported that their activities changed for the worse during their present period of unemployment; 27% reported little change, while 14% reported that their activities changed for the better after they lost their previous jobs. Thus, getting or losing a job does not make all that much difference to the activities of many dropouts. As we have seen, most of the jobs held by dropouts are somewhat marginal jobs. Hence, the presence or absence of a job may not make much of a difference.

TABLE 21

How Activities Changed When Respondents Became Currently Employed/Unemployed

	Employed Total Sub-Sample	Unemployed Total Sub-Sample
Worse	9%(6)	29%(18)
Little change	19%(13)	27%(17)
Better	28%(19)	14%(9)
Change, not specified	45%(31)	30%(19)

G. Respondents Crime and Alcohol/Drug Involvement

Criminal Involvement - Specific Crimes

Table 22 reveals that, a sizeable minority of respondents (31%) admitted to being questioned by police as a suspect for some crime in the year prior to being interviewed. [55] Twenty three percent of the sample of dropouts reported being convicted of a non-traffic crime in the same time period. Table 22 also reveals that the frequency of involvement in crime varies with the relative seriousness of the offence. The lowest reported frequency of criminal involvement was 7%, for using physical force to get money. The frequency of involvement in the offence 'attacked someone with a weapon' was similarly low at 13%. As one moves away from these more serious violent offences to those relatively less serious, the frequency of involvement by dropouts generally increases. For example: 'take something worth less than 50 dollars' — 19%; 'got into a fight just for fun' — 21%; and 'sold marijuana or other drugs' — 24%. The offence reported most often among these dropouts was 'taken something from a store', with 26% admitting to this offence in the past year.

In addition Table 22 shows that, few dropouts were repeatedly engaged in (more than three times) these specific crimes. Only two percent of the dropouts admitted to frequently

[55] All subsequent references to the frequency of criminal and alcohol/drug involvement by dropouts are for this one year time period.

using physical force to get money; only 5% reported repeatedly taking something more/less than 50 dollars, or attacking someone with a weapon. Few sample members, moreover, reported frequent convictions for non-traffic crime (4%).

While still not drastically high, the main exceptions to this lack of repeated involvement in these specific crimes are selling marijuana or other drugs (17%), and taking something from a store, or shoplifting (13%). Shoplifting and selling marijuana were thus not only the most common offences engaged in by dropouts, but were also the most repeatedly engaged in offences. These are both essentially economically oriented crimes, which could be influenced by poor labour market integration. [56] One may thus observe a stronger relationship between poor labour market integration and these type of crimes than with violent crime. As the data presented in Table 23 on total crime, property and violent crime indices indicates, there is some evidence for this assertion in the present study.

[56]This is not to say that violent crimes could not be related to poor labour market integration, but only that the relationship may not be as strong. For a state of the art review of the relationship between the economy and social pathology, including crime, see Horwitz (1984).

TABLE 22

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime

	YES	3 or more times
Been questioned by police as suspect	31% (49)	13% (20)
Been convicted of non-traffic crime	23% (35)	4% (6)
Broken into a building or car [p]	12% (18)	7% (11)
Taken something from a store [p]	26% (40)	13% (19)
Sold marijuana or other drugs [n]	24% (36)	17% (36)
Used physical force to get money [v]	7% (11)	2% (3)
Attacked someone with a weapon [v]	13% (20)	5% (8)
Got into a fight just for fun [v]	21% (33)	8% (12)
Damaged or destroyed property [p]	16% (25)	5% (7)
Taken something worth less than $50 [p]	19% (30)	5% (7)
Taken something worth more than $50 [p]	15% (23)	5% (7)

[p]= property crime, [v]= violent crime, and [n]= narcotic crime

Criminal Involvement - Crime Indices

Table 23 presents summary indices of dropouts' involvement in (i) all the specific crimes listed previously or total crime, (ii) property crime and (iii) violent crime. As can be seen when one combines dropouts' involvement across the range of specific offences, the majority report having committed at least one a criminal offence. Twenty percent of the dropouts reported 1 or 2 offences, while a much larger 41% reported 3 or more offences. A significant percentage of the dropouts may thus be termed habitually involved in crime in this period.

Dropouts in this sample are, moreover, more likely to be involved in property crime than in violent crime. This is particularly true when one looks at the percentage of dropouts who reported having committed 3 or more property versus violent crimes. These respondents

were much more likely to be habitually involved in property crime than in violent crime (27% versus 7%, respectively).

TABLE 23

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime: Total, Property and Violent

	Never % (N)	1 or 2 offences % (N)	3 or more offences % (N)
Crime (total)	39% (60)	20% (31)	41% (64)
Property Crime	57% (88)	17% (26)	27% (41)
Violent Crime	85%(132)	8% (13)	7% (10)

Alcohol and Drug Use

Table 24 shows that very few respondents use any drug daily, including alcohol. However, alcohol and cannabis are both used several times a week by approximately 20% of the sample. For the remaining majority of dropouts, alcohol is the drug of choice. Forty three percent of the dropouts reported using alcohol at least once a week, and 22% used it once or twice per month. The corresponding figures for weekly and monthly cannabis use are much smaller (10% and 12%, respectively). Very few respondents reported using other non-prescription drugs. However, a minority of the dropouts reported using such drugs less than once a month (22%). These statistics are presented here for descriptive purposes only. As noted earlier in the measurement section, given the low frequency of dropout's use of non-prescription drugs, cannabis and non-prescription drug use are combined to create a single composite drug use variable for subsequent analyses.

TABLE 24

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use

	Alcohol % (N)	Cannabis % (N)	Non-prescription % (N)
Never	6% (10)	32% (49)	65%(101)
> once a month	7% (12)	18% (27)	22% (35)
once/twice a month	22% (35)	12% (19)	8% (13)
Once a week	43% (67)	10% (16)	3% (4)
Several times per week	20% (32)	21% (33)	1% (2)
Everyday	0.6% (1)	7% (10)	0.6% (1)
Total (N)	(157)	(154)	(156)

In summary, the descriptive statistics presented in this chapter indicate that this sample of dropouts will allow us to answer the key research questions in this thesis. While respondents were generally poorly employed since leaving school, there was sufficient variation in their labour market success to look at how this factor might be related to involvement in crime, and drug and alcohol use. In addition, the sample had a sufficiently wide age range, and length of time out of school, to allow us to evaluate the impact of labour market success on deviant behavior for younger and older dropouts. The approximately equal male-female frequencies would allow us to look at gender differences in the basic labour market-deviance relationship. Finally, while most of our respondents reported some form of socio-economic support and attachments to family and friends, many did not. Thus, we can evaluate the extent to which socio-economic supports and attachment might also condition the labour market and crime, alcohol and drug use relationship.

IV. Criminal, Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Integration

The central issue in this thesis is the relationship between out-of-school labour market based measures of social controls and dropouts' out-of-school involvement in crime. Variation in the above relationships by (i) the measure of labour market integration employed and type of offence, (ii) sex and age and (iii) social suppports and/or consumptive relations is also a major research concern.

A. Labour Market Based Social Controls and Involvement in Crime

We shall analyse the relationship between four major labour market based measures of social control and dropout's involvement in the three composite crime indices. [57]

Current Labour Market Status

Table 25 presents data on dropouts' involvement in crime according to the three crime indices by current labour market status. The percentage figures in this, and the three subsequent tables, give the percent of the sample who reported committing at least one offence in the three crime categories (total, property, and violent). Most respondents who reported criminal behavior were not, however, involved in a single 'legal indiscretion'. As Table 23 shows, the majority of respondents who reported engaging in crime reported three or more offences.

As can be seen from Table 25, dropouts who are currently unemployed were much more likely than either those employed full-time or part-time to have committed crime (73%, 49% and 48%, respectively). [58] However, having a job does not mean that employed dropouts are unlikely to engage in crime. On the contrary, approximately half of both the full and part-time employed dropouts still reported having committed some crime.

---

[57]While individual property crimes were more frequently related to labour market success, no single crime, or set of crimes, was consistently related to these four labour market measures. Small cell sizes, it must be pointed out, were a major problem in individual crime item and labour market success analyses.

[58]Percentage differences of less than 10% were not considered large enough to be notable in the crosstabular analyses in this chapter.

An analysis of the indices for property crime shows an inverse relationship between current labour market status and property crime. Thirty percent of the full-time and 37% of the part-time employed dropouts, as compared to 53% of those with no job, reported engaging in property crime. There was no relationship, however, between labour market status and involvement in violent crime. The percentage of respondents involved in this type of crime was fairly low and constant across all three employment categories.

TABLE 25

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Current Labour Market Status

	Labour Market Status		
	Full-time	Part-time	No Job
Crime (Total)	49% (23)	48% (13)	73% (59)
Property crime	30% (14)	37% (10)	53% (43)
Violent crime	15% (7)	15% (4)	15% (12)

Dropouts' Criminal Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment

Table 26 presents data on dropout's involvement in total crime, property crime and violent crime by total months of unemployment. As can be seen, there is a moderate relationship between total crime and total months of unemployment. Dropouts' frequency of involvement in total crime goes from 55% to 67% to 76%, for 0 to 6, 7 to 12 and 13 or more months of total unemployment.

The index of involvement in property crime does not show any relationship with total months of unemployment. On the other hand, there does appear to be a curvilinear relationship between violent crime and total months of unemployment. The low number of cases, and small decrease in violent crime as total months unemployed goes from 7-12 to 13

or more, however, mitigates against making much of these findings.

TABLE 26

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Total Months of Unemployment

	Months of Unemployment		
	0 to 6	7 to 12	13(+)
Crime (Total)	55% (28)	67% (24)	76% (29)
Property crime	45% (23)	47% (17)	47% (18)
Violent crime	6% (3)	25% (9)	21% (8)

Dropouts' Criminal Involvement by Length of Jobs Held

Table 27 presents data on dropout's involvement in crime using the summary indices total crime, property crime and violent crime by length of jobs held. As can be seen, there is no relationship between length of jobs held by dropouts and their involvement in crime as measured by any of these three crime indices.

TABLE 27

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Length of Jobs Held

	Length of Jobs	
	Short	Short/Long
Crime (Total)	60% (35)	60% (41)
Property crime	48% (28)	43% (29)
Violent crime	12% (7)	15% (10)

Dropouts' Criminal Involvement by Number of Jobs Held

From Table 28 it is obvious that there is only a small relationship between the total crime index and the number of jobs held: 69% of dropouts reporting 4 or more jobs, as opposed to 55% of dropouts with up to 3 jobs, have committed one or more of the total list of crimes. However, the relationship exists only because of the property crime index. There is no relationship between the violent crime index and number of jobs held. For property crime, however, the percentage of dropouts reporting involvement goes from 56% for dropouts with 4 or more jobs, down to 35% for those who reported having only up to 3 jobs.

TABLE 28

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total), Property Crime and Violent Crime by Number of Jobs Held

	Number of Jobs	
	0 to 3	4(+)
Crime (Total)	55% (38)	69% (42)
Property crime	35% (24)	56% (34)
Violent crime	15% (10)	15% (9)

B. Labour Market Integration Based Social Controls and Alcohol/Drug Involvement

We shall conclude the present chapter with an analysis of the relationship between the four labour market integration based measures of social control and the frequency of alcohol and drug use by dropouts.

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Current Employment Status

As can be seen from Table 29, there are no major differences between dropouts employed full-time, part-time or unemployed in terms of their frequency of alcohol usage. However, the frequency of heavy alcohol use does increase somewhat from 15% for full-time employed dropouts to 25% and 23% for part-time employed and unemployed dropouts, respectively. As can also be seen, there is not a systematic relationship between current labour market status and frequency of drug use among these dropouts.

TABLE 29

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Current Employment Status

	Current Labour Market Status Full-time/Part-time/No Job	Current Labour Market Status Full-time/Part-time/No Job
Frequency*	Alcohol	Drugs**
Never-Moderate	85%(40)/75%(21)/77%(63)	75%(35)/79%(22)/68%(55)
Heavy	15%(7)/25%(7)/23%(19)	26%(12)/21%(6)/32%(26)
Total (N)	(47)/(28)/(82)	(47)/(28)/(81)

* The variables alcohol and drugs were collapsed for analysis into two basic categories of usage. These categories are never-moderate (never to once a week) and heavy use (several times a week to everyday).

** The frequency of dropouts usage of non-prescription drugs, other than cannabis, was so low as to make it unusable as a separate variable. The variable drugs thus includes cannabis (marijuana/hashish) and non-prescription drugs (speed, LSD, qualudes etc.)

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Total Months of Unemployment

Data on the frequency of alcohol and drug use by total months of unemployment are presented in Table 30. As can be seen, there is a moderately strong relationship between total months of unemployment and heavy alcohol use. The percentage of dropouts reporting heavy alcohol use increases from 14% to 22% to 33% for dropouts with low (0-6), medium (7-12) and high (13+) months of total uemployment, respectively.

Table 30 also reveals a reasonably strong relationship between total months of unemployment experienced by dropouts and frequency of drug use. The percentage of dropouts reporting heavy drug use increases from 20% to 33% to 46% as one moves from 0-6 to 7-12 to 13 or more months of total unemployment experienced.

TABLE 30

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Total Months of Unemployment

	Months Unemployed 0 - 6 / 7 - 12 / 13(+)	Months Unemployed 0 - 6 / 7 - 12 / 13(+)
Frequency	Alcohol	Drugs
Never-Moderate	87%(45)/78%(28)/67%(26)	80%(41)/67%(24)/54%(21)
Heavy	14%(7)/22%(8)/33%(13)	20%(10)/33%(12)/46%(18)
Total (N)	(52)/(36)/(39)	(51)/(36)/(39)

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Length of Jobs Held

Data are presented in Table 31 on dropout's frequency of alcohol use by length of jobs held by dropouts. From Table 31 it is obvious that dropouts who have had at least some long-term jobs are higher in their frequency of heavy alcohol use (29%) than dropouts with only short-term jobs (17%). [59] In this table, data are also presented on dropout's frequency of drug use by length of jobs held. As can be seen from Table 31, there is not much of a relationship between length of jobs held and the frequency of heavy drug use.

TABLE 31

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Length of Jobs Held

	Length of Job Short /Short-Long	Length of Job Short /Short-Long
Frequency	Alcohol	Drugs
Never-Moderate	83%(49)/71%(49)	72%(42)/67%(46)
Heavy	17%(10)/29%(20)	28%(16)/33%(23)
Total (N)	(59)/(69)	(58)/(69)

[59]Whether this is simply an effect of age or related more to labour market experience is difficult to say.

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Number of Jobs Held

In Table 32 data are presented on the frequency of alcohol and drug use by number of jobs held. There is a fairly strong inverse relationship between this measure of labour market integration and alcohol use. As the degree of labour market integration goes down, as indicated by an increasing number of jobs, the frequency of heavy use of alcohol increases from 10% to 31%. In terms of the frequency of drug use by dropouts, it can be seen that there is again a reasonably strong relationship between this variable and number of jobs held. The frequency of dropouts reporting heavy drug use increases from 17% for dropouts with up to 3 jobs, to 38% for dropouts with 4 or more jobs.

TABLE 32

Dropouts' Frequency of Alcohol and Drug Use by Number of Jobs Held

	Number of Jobs 0 - 3 / 4(+)	Number of Jobs 0 - 3 / 4(+)
Frequency	Alcohol	Drugs
Never-Moderate	90%(64)/69%(42)	83%(58)/62%(38)
Heavy	10%(7)/31%(19)	17%(12)/38%(23)
Total (N)	(71)/(61)	(70)/(61)

In summary, in this chapter we found eight (out of twenty) substantial zero-order relationships between labour market integration measures and involvement in crime, and alcohol and drug use. Each of these eight relationships was as predicted by our out-of-school extension of social control theory. Low labour market-based commitment was associated with high crime and heavy alcohol/drug use. Only one relatively weak relationship, between length of jobs held and alcohol use, was found which went contrary to what we expected in our extension of social control theory. We thus conclude that in certain instances labour market integration measures are related to involvement in crime and drug and alcohol use. However, as only eight out of twenty analyses showed a substantial relationship, we must conclude that,

while they are important, labour market social controls are not the only major social controls in the lives of dropouts.

V. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Integration by Sex and Age

In this chapter we extend and refine the data analysis by answering the second main research question: to what extent are there sex and age based variations in the relationship between labour market based measures of social controls and dropouts' involvement in crime, alcohol, and drugs? Several methodological notes are here required.

Given the nature of the data and research question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) is the most appropriate method. The specification of main effects in ANOVA provides an analysis of the extent to which each of the crime, alcohol and drug variables is related to sex and age, in and of themselves. Through the specification of two-way interaction effects, ANOVA allows us to examine the extent to which the relationship between each of the four labour market based measures of social controls and crime/alcohol/drugs vary by sex and age. We present these interaction effects separately for each of the four labour market measures.

In chapter 4 we utilized a crosstabular data analysis procedure which is based upon percentage differences in respondents' falling into the various categories of two variables. ANOVA, on the other hand, is based upon differences in the mean values of the dependent variable (e.g. crime) for several categories of the independent variable (e.g. current employment status). Given this specification of mean values, ANOVA presents a somewhat more refined picture of the relationship between important variables than that provided by crosstabular analysis (which requires us to collapse variables into a few crude categories). For example, not only would we know how many unemployed dropouts, as opposed to full-time employed dropouts, committed crime but we would also know how much more criminogenic they were, on average, given the specification of mean cell values in ANOVA.

One caution must be provided about these mean values, however. As an analysis of the frequency distributions for the crime variables revealed, these variables were heavily skewed, as is normally the case with most measures of deviant behavior (most people commit little, a few people commit a lot). In order to overcome this problem of skewness, the crime

variables were transformed by taking the log of the original variable values. Thus, the mean values presented for the crime variables are mean logged values. [60]

As in the previous chapter, we shall focus only upon the three cumulative crime indices – total crime, property crime and violent crime – which were developed in the previous chapter. The primary reason for this is that the number of subjects admitting to any one criminal offence is often fairly low. Given that we shall now also be splitting the sample into male/female and older/younger respondents the problem of small cell sizes arises. By focusing only upon the cumulative crime indices, reasonably adequate cell frequencies are achieved.

In the ANOVA tables which follow, we will discuss only those main effects which are significant at $p < .10$ or less. The 2-way interaction effects, on the other hand, will not be tabled at all unless they achieve this level of significance. These significance values are chosen as an aid in determining which relationships are sufficiently strong to merit attention in this thesis, particularly in the qualitative analysis which is to follow. They are thus not employed as tests of significance per se. [61]

Finally, we must note that sex and age main effects are tabled for each of the four labour market – crime/alcohol/drug analyses. As can be seen in the tables which follow, sometimes sex and/or age do exhibit substantial ($p < .10$) main effects, and sometimes they do not. One possible reason may be that we do not have information from an equal number of, nor necessarily the same, respondents for each of the four labour market variables of concern here. [62] Nonetheless, these age and sex effects do remain relatively the same across the four labour market measure-based analyses. Thus, while tabled for each labour market variable, age and sex main effects are discussed only once, in the first analysis presented. This

[60]The original un-logged frequency of total crimes committed in the past year ranged from 0 to 245, for the sample as a whole. The logged crime frequencies, given the nature of the log conversion process, run from 0.0 to approximately 1.0.

[61]Given the non-random nature of the dropout sample and the fact that we are not engaged in hypothesis testing per se, tests of significance are, strictly speaking, inappropriate.

[62]As noted previously, one of the main sources of missing data arises from the fact that not all respondents would have been asked for, nor provided equivalent information during the face to face interview from which the labour market variables were constructed.

concern, however, does lead us to another perhaps more important issue: how different are the sub-samples for whom we do have information from the sample as a whole?

A comparison of response frequencies for a range of variables for the majority of the sample who were included in the analyses with the missing cases who were not, reveals no major systematic differences between the two groups. These two groups were compared on variables such as respondents' financial status, sex, age, total crime, property crime, violent crime and drug/alcohol involvement. In addition, the two categories of respondents were compared to see if the missing case respondents were disproportionately from the Belmont Correctional Centre sampling group. This was a sampling category which, given their incarceration, might not have provided a lot of information on their labour force activity. However, only differences noted were that missing case respondents were somewhat more likely to be younger females, who may have been slightly less deviant than the sample of dropouts in general.

A. Criminal Involvement

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

Table 33 presents data on dropout's involvement in total crime by current labour market status by sex and age (i.e., 15-21 and 22-27 yrs.). As can be seen from this table, there is a significant main effect of current labour market status on total crime. Specifically, the mean total crime value goes from a low of 0.38 and 0.36 for full and part-time employed dropouts, respectively, to a high of 0.65 for those dropouts with no job. There is also a substantial main affect for sex, with the mean total crime value for males doubling that for females (0.70 and 0.34, respectively). No main effect was found for age, nor were there any significant 2-way interactions.

TABLE 33

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime (Total) by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

CRIME (TOTAL)	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Labour Market Status	1.800	2	3.017	0.052*
Sex	3.808	1	12.763	0.000*
Age	0.169	1	0.567	0.453
Cell Means*				
Labour Market Status	Full-time	Part-time	No Job	
	0.38 (47)	0.36 (27)	0.65 (81)	
Sex	Female	Male		
	0.34 (77)	0.70 (78)		
Total Sample Mean	0.52 (155)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Table 34 presents data on dropout's involvement in property crime by current labour market status by sex and age. As an analysis of the main effects reveals, there is a substantial relationship between labour market status and property crime. The mean property crime value increases from 0.17 to 0.24 to 0.43 as labour market status goes down from full to part-time employment, to no job, respectively. Males were also substantially more involved in property crime than females, with the mean property crime values equalling 0.19 for females and 0.43 for males. But again there was no age effect.

Unlike the case for total crime, however, there is a substantial 2-way interaction effect between labour market status, sex and involvement in property crime. An analysis of the cell means in Table 34 revealed while female involvement in property crime does increase with decreasing current labour market success, it none the less remains relatively low compared to males. It is males who show the greatest impact of poor current labour market status upon involvement in property crime. The mean property crime values for males go from 0.20 to 0.26 for full and part-time employed dropouts, respectively, to a high of 0.57 for dropouts currently unemployed. It is thus primarily for males that an inverse relationship exists between current labour market integration and involvement in property crime.

It is instructive to point out that full-time employed females had the lowest mean rate of involvement in property crime (0.14), while unemployed males had the highest (0.57). This group of females might be experiencing both workplace social controls, as well as traditional under-the-roof social controls (cf. McCarthy and Hagan, 1987), thereby resulting in quite low criminal involvement. Unemployed males, on the other hand, may be much less subject to both of these major variants of social control and thus relatively free to engage in crime.

TABLE 34

Dropouts' Involvement in Property Crime by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

PROPERTY CRIME		Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects					
Labour Market Status - Sex		1.444	2	3.778	0.025*
Sex		1.651	1	8.642	0.004*
Age		0.346	1	1.812	0.180
2-way Interaction					
Labour Market Status - Sex		0.954	2	2.497	0.086*
Cell Means*					
Labour Market Status		Full-time		Part-time	No Job
		0.17 (47)		0.24 (27)	0.43 (81)
Sex		Female		Male	
		0.19 (77)		0.43 (78)	
Labour Market Status - Sex		Full-time		Part-time	No Job
	Female	0.14 (28)		0.23 (16)	0.22 (33)
	Male	0.20 (19)		0.26 (11)	0.57 (48)
Total Sample Mean		0.31 (155)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Data on dropout's involvement in violent crime by current labour market status by sex and age are presented in Table 35. As can be seen, the only substantial main effect is for sex by involvement in violent crime. While the mean violent crime values were low relative to property crime, males were much more likely than females to be involved in violent crime (0.15 and 0.03, respectively). There were no 2-way interactions involving sex or age found

between labour market status and violent crime.

TABLE 35

Dropouts' Involvement in Violent Crime by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

VIOLENT CRIME	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Labour Market Status	0.017	2	0.141	0.868
Sex	0.580	1	9.658	0.002*
Age	0.129	1	2.143	0.145
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female	Male		
	0.03 (77)	0.15 (78)		
Total Sample Mean	0.09 (155)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime Indices by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age

Next we repeat the analysis for the labour market measure total months of unemployment. Table 36 presents dropout's involvement in total crime by total months of unemployment by sex and age. From this table it can be seen that there are no substantial 2-way interactions involving either sex or age and total months of unemployment for the total crime index.

TABLE 36

Total Crime by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age

CRIME (TOTAL)	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Unemployment	2.902	2	4.551	0.013*
Sex	4.770	1	14.957	0.000*
Age	1.243	1	3.899	0.051*
Cell Means*				
Unemployment	0-6	7-12	13(+)	
	0.44 (51)	0.68 (36)	0.69 (38)	
Sex	Female	Male		
	0.38 (58)	0.76 (67)		
Age	Older	Younger		
	0.53 (65)	0.64 (60)		
Total Sample Mean	0.58 (125)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Table 37 presents data on dropout's involvement in property crime by total months of unemployment by sex and age. There were again, as can be seen from this table, no substantial 2-way interactions.

TABLE 37

Property Crime by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age

PROPERTY CRIME	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Unemployment	0.464	2	0.993	0.374
Sex	2.243	1	9.608	0.002*
Age	0.987	1	4.225	0.042*
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female	Male		
	0.22 (58)	0.49 (67)		
Age	Older	Younger		
	0.29 (65)	0.44 (60)		
Total Sample Mean	0.36 (125)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Data are provided in Table 38 on dropout's involvement in violent crime by total months unemployment by sex and age. This table shows that there is a substantial 2-way interaction effect of total months of unemployment and sex on violent crime. As can be seen from the cell means for unemployment by sex, the curvilinear relationship between total months of unemployment and involvement in violent crime only holds for male dropouts, but not females. The specific mean violent crime involvement values for females go up very little as females experience greater amounts of unemployment, and this has a supressing effect on the original unemployment – violent crime relationship noted in the main effects section of Table 39. As can be seen, when females are excluded, the curvilinear relationship between total months of unemployment and violent crime is much stronger. For male dropouts with 0-6, 7-12 and 13 or more months of unemployment, the mean involvement in violent crime values go from a low of 0.05 to a high of 0.35 and then decrease again to 0.15, respectively.

TABLE 38

Violent Crime by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age

VIOLENT CRIME		Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects					
Unemployment		0.837	2	6.662	0.002*
Sex		0.592	1	9.418	0.003*
Age		0.337	1	5.363	0.022*
2-way Interaction					
Unemployment-Sex		0.361	2	2.874	0.061*
Cell Means*					
Unemployment		0-6		7-12	13(+)
		0.03 (51)		0.21 (36)	0.11 (38)
Sex		Female		Male	
		0.03 (58)		0.17 (67)	
Age		Older		Younger	
		0.07 (65)		0.14 (60)	
Unemployment - Sex		0-6		7-12	13(+)
	Female	0.00 (23)		0.03 (16)	0.06 (19)
	Male	0.05 (28)		0.35 (20)	0.15 (19)
Total Sample Mean		0.10 (125)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime Indices by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

Table 39 presents data on dropout's involvement in total crime by length of jobs held by sex and age. Respondents were categorized into two groups for analysis, those with only short-term employment previously and those with at least some long-term periods of employment. There are no noteworthy 2-way interactions between either sex or age and length of jobs held for total crime.

In Table 40 data are presented on dropout's involvement in property crime by length of jobs held by sex and age. Again, no important 2-way interactions are found.

Finally, Table 41 presents data on dropout's involvement in violent crime by length of jobs held by sex and age, and similar findings emerge as for Tables 39 and 40. Again there are no 2-way interactions involving either sex or age. The pattern here is fairly clear, sex and age

do not have much of an effect on the labour market-crime relationship.

TABLE 39

Total Crime by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

CRIME (TOTAL)	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Length of Job	0.001	1	0.004	0.947
Sex	5.745	1	17.297	0.000*
Age	0.239	1	0.720	0.398
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female		Male	
	0.30 (58)		0.73 (68)	
Total Sample Mean	0.53 (126)			

* significant at $p < .10$

TABLE 40

Property Crime by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

PROPERTY CRIME	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Length of Job	0.804	1	0.178	0.674
Sex	2.156	1	9.677	0.002*
Age	0.548	1	2.461	0.119
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female		Male	
	0.20 (58)		0.47 (68)	
Total Sample Mean	0.34 (126)			

* significant at $p < .10$

TABLE 41

Violent Crime by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

VIOLENT CRIME	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Length of Job	0.000	1	0.001	0.970
Sex	0.697	1	10.938	0.001*
Age	0.052	1	0.817	0.368
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female		Male	
	0.01 (58)		0.16 (68)	
Total Sample Mean	0.09 (126)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Dropouts' Involvement in Crime Indices by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

In Table 42, data are provided on dropout's involvement in total crime by number of jobs held by sex and age. No 2-way interactions are observed involving sex and age, and number of jobs held.

TABLE 42

Total Crime by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

CRIME (TOTAL)	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Number of Jobs	1.067	1	3.576	0.061*
Sex	3.001	1	10.060	0.002*
Age	0.250	1	0.836	0.362
Cell Means*				
Number of Jobs	1 - 3		4 (+)	
	0.42 (69)		0.62 (61)	
Sex	Female		Male	
	0.34 (61)		0.67 (69)	
Total Sample Mean	0.52 (130)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Table 43 focuses on dropout's involvement in property crime by number of jobs held by sex and age. As is obvious, no 2-way interactions are found involving sex and age and number of jobs held.

TABLE 43

Property Crime by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

PROPERTY CRIME	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Number of Jobs	0.474	1	0.474	0.150
Sex	1.363	1	6.022	0.016*
Age	0.610	1	2.697	0.103*
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female		Male	
	0.21 (61)		0.44 (69)	
Age	Older		Younger	
	0.28 (68)		0.39 (62)	
Total Sample Mean	0.33 (130)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Data on dropout's involvement in violent crime by number of jobs held by sex and age are presented in Table 44, and again no 2-way interactions are found.

TABLE 44

Violent Crime by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

VIOLENT CRIME	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Number of Jobs	0.019	1	0.346	0.558
Sex	0.486	1	8.650	0.004*
Age	0.023	1	0.406	0.525
Cell Means*				
Sex	Female	Male		
	0.02 (61)	0.14 (69)		
Total Sample Mean	0.08 (130)			

* significant at $p < .10$

B. Alcohol and Drug Involvement

In this section our primary concern is with sex and age based variation in the relationship between the four labour market measures of social control and dropout's involvement with alcohol and drugs. Consistent with the first half of this chapter, we shall again employ analysis of variance. Given the results obtained, however, the main effects require a little more attention here. Finally, the cell means in this section are derived from a 0-5 scale of alcohol and drug involvement:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Never	Less than once per month	Once/twice per month	Once per week	Several times per week	Every day

While this is based on an ordinal level of measurement, it was treated here as an interval level scale.

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

As can be seen from Table 45, there are no significant main effects or 2-way interaction effects on dropout's alcohol use by current labour market status by sex and age.

Given that alcohol is a commonly used substance for virtually all dropouts, it is not surprising that it is not used by any one category of dropouts all that much more than any other. However, the same cannot be said of illegal drug use.

In Table 46, data are presented on dropouts' use of drugs by current labour market status by sex and age. As is obvious from this table, there is a main effect of sex on drug involvement. Males use drugs much more frequently than do females (means of 1.97 and 1.45, respectively). What is most interesting here, however, is the existence of a 2-way interaction between sex and age on drug involvement.

As the cell means in Table 46 reveal, the greater involvement of males in drugs is much stronger, and indeed only substantial, for older males versus older females. The mean drug involvement values for younger males and females are 1.71 and 1.56, respectively, not all that much different. The mean drug involvement values for older males and females, however, are 2.22 and 1.31, respectively. In other words, older females use less illegal drugs while older males use more. [63] Older females in this sample of dropouts may thus be posited as coming under the greatest amount of social control, while the converse is apparently true of older male dropouts.

TABLE 45

Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

ALCOHOL	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Labour Market Status	0.145	2	0.073	0.944
Sex	1.227	1	0.964	0.328
Age	0.098	1	0.077	0.782

[63] Older females may, however, be using legal drugs, such as valium.

TABLE 46

Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Sex and Age

DRUGS		Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects					
Labour Market Status		2.803	2	0.167	0.541
Sex		8.531	1	3.757	0.055*
Age		0.951	1	0.419	0.518
2-way Interaction					
Sex-Age		6.488	1	2.857	0.093*
Cell Means*					
Sex		Female		Male	
		1.45 (78)		1.97 (78)	
Sex-Age		Female		Male	
	Older	1.31 (35)		2.22 (40)	
	Younger	1.56 (43)		1.71 (38)	
Total Sample Mean		1.71 (156)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment

Data are presented in Tables 47 and 48 on dropout's alcohol and drug involvement by total months of unemployment by sex and age. In these tables a pattern emerges which is similar to, yet different in one crucial aspect from, that which appears in Table 46 and 47. Again there are no main or 2-way interaction effects for alcohol involvement, this time for total months of unemployment by sex and age. Again there is a main and a 2-way interaction effect when we shift our analysis to drug use by dropouts.

As can be seen from Table 49, there is a main effect of sex on drug involvement. The mean drug involvement value for males is 2.12, but only 1.54 for females. In this case this main sex effect is not substantially altered by the introduction of age into the analysis. But in this case the 2-way interaction effect is between total months of unemployment, which here showed no main effect, and age.

As can be seen from an analysis of the cell means for the variable total months of unemployment, only a moderate rise in drug involvement occurs as the total number of months of unemployment increases. However, when one splits the sample into older and younger dropouts a substantial and complex relationship between total months of unemployment and drug involvement does appear for both older and younger dropouts.

The cell means for total months of unemployment by age reveal that there is a substantial curvilinear relationship between total months of unemployment and drug involvement for older dropouts. Here the mean drug involvement value goes from a low of 1.50 to a high of 2.39 and down again to 1.86, as one goes from 0-6 to 7-12 to 13 or more months of total unemployment experienced. For younger dropouts, however, the relationship is more linear. Younger dropouts with 0-6 and 7-12 total months of unemployment are fairly low and approximately equal in terms of their mean drug involvement score, 1.67 and 1.50, respectively. This mean drug involvement increases substantially, however, for younger dropouts who have experienced over a year of total unemployment, rising to a value of 2.70.

This is the highest mean drug involvement value in this specific analysis. In terms of the emphasis upon social control in the present thesis, it would appear that younger dropouts who have experienced the greatest amount of total unemployment are subject to the least amount of social control, at least for drug use. [44] In the following qualitative analysis we shall attempt to isolate those components in the lives of these dropouts which, apart from their experience of unemployment, may help explain, this pattern in the quantitative data.

---

[44] With these younger dropouts peer pressure may also be an important factor determining degree of illegal drug use.

TABLE 47

Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age

ALCOHOL	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Unemployment	5.160	2	2.180	0.118
Sex	0.462	1	0.390	0.534
Age	1.127	1	0.952	0.331

TABLE 48

Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Sex and Age

DRUGS		Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects					
Unemployment		5.579	2	1.260	0.287
Sex		11.123	1	5.009	0.027*
Age		0.021	1	0.009	0.923
2-way Interaction					
Unemployment-Age		14.988	2	3.375	0.038*
Cell Means*					
Unemployment		0 - 6	7 - 12	13 (+)	
		1.61 (51)	1.94 (36)	2.08 (39)	
Sex		Female	Male		
		1.54 (59)	2.12 (67)		
Unemployment - Age		0 - 6	7 - 12	13 (+)	
	Older	1.50 (18)	2.39 (18)	1.86 (29)	
	Younger	1.67 (33)	1.50 (18)	2.70 (10)	
Total Sample Mean		1.85 (126)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

Tables 49 and 50 present data on the alcohol and drug involvement of dropouts by length of jobs held by sex and age, respectively. As is obvious from Table 49, only one substantial main effect exists for alcohol involvement, and that is by length of jobs held.

Unlike the vast majority of relationships analysed to date, the relationship between length of jobs held and alcohol involvement is contrary to that expected. Dropouts who have had at least some long-term jobs, thereby indicating somewhat better labour market performance, are moderately higher than dropouts with only short-term jobs in terms of their mean involvement with alcohol. One explanation for these results is that long-term employment likely provides more money for alcohol consumption. Relatively moderate alcohol use may thus be more a reflection of cash supply than a response to reduced social controls. No 2-way interactions were found to exist in this analysis.

In Table 50 data are presented on dropout's drug involvement by length of jobs held by sex and age. A main effect of sex upon drug involvement is the only relationship of note in this table. Males again have a substantially greater mean drug involvement score than females (2.06 and 1.51, respectively). Again no 2-way interactions were found in the present specific analysis.

TABLE 49

Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

ALCOHOL	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Length of Job	2.914	1	2.800	0.097*
Sex	2.482	1	2.384	0.125
Age	0.072	1	0.069	0.793
Cell Means*				
Lenght of Jobs	Short		Short-Long	
	2.63 (59)		2.90 (69)	
Total Sample Mean	2.77 (128)			

* significant at $p < .10$

TABLE 50

Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

DRUGS	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Length of Job	0.000	1	0.000	1.000
Sex	9.494	1	3.992	0.048*
Age	0.711	1	0.299	0.586
Cell Means*				
Sex ——	Female		Male	
	1.51 (59)		2.06 (68)	
Total Sample Mean	1.80 (127)			

* significant at $p < .10$

Dropouts' Alcohol and Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

The final data to be presented in this chapter are on dropout's involvement with alcohol and drugs by number of jobs held by sex and age. These data are presented in Tables 51 and 52, respectively. As is obvious from an analysis of Table 51, there are no main and no 2-way interaction effects for alcohol involvement by number of jobs held by sex and age.

The data presented in Table 52, however, show a substantial main effect for number of jobs held and sex on involvement with drugs. Dropouts who have had 4 or more jobs are substantially higher on drug involvement than those dropouts who have had only up to 3 jobs (1.93 and 1.39, respectively). Similarly, male dropouts were substantially higher than female dropouts, in terms of their involvement with drugs (1.88 and 1.37, respectively). With this data we cannot say whether this pattern of results occurs because it is primarily males who have had 4 or more jobs. However, this is a distinct possibility. No substantial 2-way interaction effects were found in the present analysis.

TABLE 51

Dropouts' Alcohol Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

ALCOHOL	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Number of Jobs	2.073	1	1.784	0.184
Sex	1.483	1	1.276	0.261
Age	0.029	1	0.025	0.875

TABLE 52

Dropouts' Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Sex and Age

DRUGS	Sum of Squares	DF	F	Sig.F
Main Effects				
Number of Jobs	6.568	1	2.890	0.092*
Sex	6.722	1	2.957	0.088*
Age	0.333	1	0.147	0.703
Cell Means*				
Number of Jobs	1 - 3	4 (+)		
	1.39 (70)	1.93 (61)		
Sex	Female	Male		
	1.37 (62)	1.88 (69)		
Total Sample Mean	1.64 (131)			

* significant at $p < .10$

What can we conclude from this chapter? First, alcohol use was relatively high and constant for most dropouts across a range of conditions. Second, males use more drugs than females. But more importantly, we observed only three 2-way interaction effects. In the two instances where we find sex to be important it was males who exhibited higher property and violent crime when experiencing poor labour market integration. In the third 2-way interaction, we found that age affected the relationship between total months unemployed and drug use. For younger dropouts more months of unemployment were associated with increased drug use. For older respondents, drug use was highest among those who had been

unemployed an intermediate length of time. Thus, generally sex and age did not condition the relationship between labour market social controls and involvement with crime, alcohol and drugs.

VI. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Integration by Non-Labour Market Social Controls

In this chapter, our concern is to answer the third primary research question in this thesis: to what extent are non-labour market social controls in the lives of dropouts related (i) either by themselves, or (ii) in conjunction with poor labour market integration, to involvement in crime and with drugs? Alcohol was dropped from the analysis due to the fact that it showed very little variation in previous analyses, i.e. it was relatively high and constant for most subjects across a range of conditions.

There are three categories of non-labour market social control variables of specific concern here. General commitment is operationalized with three measures, namely: (i) had respondents selected a future occupation, (ii) would respondents get more education and (iii) respondents' financial status. The second category is involvement in conventional activity, measured by (i) conventional association (index) and (ii) primary things done with friends. The third category of social controls is attachment, measured by a two item index.

The method of data analysis in this chapter is again analysis of variance (ANOVA), again repeated for different labour market measures. Age and sex are also included as variables in these analyses. However, 3-way interactions utilizing these variables were not examined due to the extremely low number of cases involved. Nonetheless, with age and sex included in the ANOVA program, the possibility of spurious relationships, due to the influence of sex and age, is eliminated.

A. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: ANOVA Main Effects

Table 53 presents data on the extent to which we find substantial main effects between crime/drug involvement and non-labour market variables ($p < .10$). As in previous data chapters, separate analyses were done on sample sub-sets who provided information on one as opposed to another of the four major labour market variables (i.e. current employment

status, total months of unemployment, length of jobs and number of jobs held). Table 53 thus indicates whether a main effect was found between the non-labour market variables and crime/drugs in any of these four analyses.

TABLE 53

Crime/Drug Involvement by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: ANOVA Main Effects[65]

Non-Labour Market Controls	Total	Property	Violent	Drugs
Future occupation selected				
Get more education				
R's financial status	Main (1)	Main (1)		Main (2)
Conventional associations (index)				
Things R did with friends				Main (3)
Attachment (index)	Main (4)	Main (4)		Main (4)

Having said this, it is obvious from Table 53 that there were not all that many substantial main effects between these measures of non-labour market based social controls and involvement in crime/drugs. This was particularly true for the index of violent crime; we did not find a substantial main effect for this dependent variable. Two of the six non-labour market measures have significant main effects on total crime. Property crime is affected by two, and drug use by three of these variables. In terms of the non-labour market variables, the respondent's financial status and attachment, in particular, appear to have effects on these dependent variables. In Table 54 we elaborate upon the nature of the main effects listed in Table 53, presenting cell means for each of the main effects.

[65]The number to the right of the "main" notation in this table indicates how frequently, to a maximum of 4, the main effect was found to exist. That is, since four different analyses (one for each labour market measure) were done, the non-labour market measures could have a significant main effect up to four times.

TABLE 54

Crime/Drug Involvement by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: Main Effects-Cell Means

	Degree of Social Control	
Non-Labour Market Controls	High	Low
R's financial status by total crime	0.37 (89)	0.56 (40)
R's financial status by property crime	0.26 (89)	0.50 (40)
R's financial status by drugs	1.62 (89)	2.19 (36)
Things R did with friends by drugs	1.52 (66)	2.02 (64)
Attachment (index) by total crime	0.32 (91)	0.56 (60)
Attachment (index) by property crime	0.23 (91)	0.45 (60)
Attachment (index) by drugs	1.41 (91)	2.15 (60)

From the cell mean values for crime and drug involvement presented in Table 54, one fact is evident. Whatever the non-labour market measure of social control and measure of illegal behaviour used, dropouts with lower social controls were much more involved in crime and with drugs. More specifically, dropouts with low social controls, as measured by the variables in Table 54, were approximately twice as high on criminal involvement and 50% higher on illegal drug use than dropouts higher on these social controls.[66]

In summary then, it would appear that in some cases different measures of non-labour market based social controls are related to different types of illegal behavior. However, the degree of social control provided by these non-labour factors would appear to be similarly substantial in all cases.

B. Criminal and Drug Involvement by Labour Market Variables by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: ANOVA 2-Way Interactions

Data are presented in Table 55 on the extent to which we find substantial variation in dropouts' criminal and drug involvement by the four labour market variables and six

[66] The things respondents did with friends variable includes activities such as partying and drug use, which were here coded as low social control activities. The finding of a relationship between this variable and drug use must be viewed with this in mind. However, the measure is included in this chapter basically because it is not tautological to relate involvement in crime with this important variable.

non-labour market social controls. Given that there are six potential conditioning non-labour market variables and four labour market measures, there are a total of twenty-four possible two-way interactions per measure of illegal behavior. Having noted this, it is evident that there were very few 2-way interactions in any of the analyses undertaken. We find only three 2-way interaction effects for total crime, one for property crime, and two for violent crime. The largest number of 2-way interactions (four) between labour market and non-labour market social controls was found for drug use.

We now turn to an analysis of the cell means for the 2-way interactions. Are crime and drug involvement highest when both labour market and non-labour market social controls are lowest, as social control theory predicts?

TABLE 55

Crime/Drug Involvement by Labour Market Variables by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-Way Interactions

Labour Market Variables	Total	Property	Violent	Drugs
Current employment status	things done* with friends			future occupation selected
Total months unemployed				get more education
Length of jobs held	R's $ status	R's $ status	attachment (index)	future occupation selected get more education
Number of jobs held	get more education		conventional association (index)	

* Relationships where a significant two-way interaction was identified.

Crime/Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Non-Labour Market Social Controls

Table 56 presents substantial 2-way interaction cell means for crime/drug involvement by current labour market status by non-labour market variables. The first 2-way interaction follows the logic of social control theory. When labour market social controls (current employment status) and non-labour market controls (primary things done with friends) are lowest, we see the highest rate of involvement in total crime (0.63). However, for dropouts low on this non-labour market social control, the rate of involvement in total crime was only slightly lower for part-time employed respondents than it was for unemployed respondents (0.61). Being employed part-time apparently did little to reduce crime if dropouts engaged primarily in low social control activities with their friends. On the other hand, part-time employed respondents who engaged in high social control activities were quite unlikely, the lowest in the sample, to be involved in crime (0.14). This indicates that these latter dropouts were somehow a select group for whom part-time employment was not, perhaps, necessarily all that negative a life experience.

In the second 2-way interaction in Table 56, we do not see what we would expect based upon social control theory. It would appear that being low on the social control "future occupation selected" contributes little to dropouts' drug use. The one exception was that dropouts low on this social control and employed part-time had the lowest degree of drug use in the whole sample (0.43). However, this is contrary to what social control theory would predict. [67]

[67]The problem of small cell size is particularly acute here, it is the lowest in this chapter. Caution must thus be used when considering this finding.

TABLE 56

Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Current Labour Market Status by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions

(1) Labour market status by things done with friends by total crime

	High S.C.		Low S.C.
	Full-time	Part-time	No Job
High S.C.	0.31 (20)	0.14 (13)	0.45 (33)
Low S.C.	0.21 (21)	0.61 (10)	0.63 (33)

(1) Labour market status by future occupation selected by drugs

	Full-time	Part-time	No Job
High S.C.	1.42 (36)	1.95 (19)	2.02 (57)
Low S.C.	1.64 (11)	0.43 (7)	1.42 (19)

Crime/Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Non-Labour Market Social Controls

Cell means highlighting substantial 2-way interaction for crime/drug involvement by total months of unemployment by non-labour market variables are presented in Table 57. As is obvious from this table, only one 2-way interaction exists between this labour market social control and non-labour market social controls, and it is in large part consistent with social control theory. As the non-labour market social control (get more education) and the labour market control (months unemployed) go down drug use goes up substantially. However, a curvilinear effect occurs. The highest rate of drug use was found for dropouts who did not plan to get more education who also had experienced seven to twelve months of unemployment (2.33). Dropouts in this group with thirteen or more months of unemployment have noticeably lower drug use (1.60).

This pattern of results indicates that there is a limit to the degree of deviant behavior produced by some conditions of low social control. As research on youths indicates, social isolation and withdrawal, a type of non-criminal deviance, is also a likely response to poor labour market integration. However, given the small number of cases we must be very

cautious in our interpretation of these results.

TABLE 57

Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Total Months of Unemployment by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions

	High S.C.		Low S.C.
(1) Total months unemployed by get more education by drugs			
	0-6	7-12	13(+)
High S.C.	1.42 (31)	1.77 (26)	2.19 (26)
Low S.C.	1.72 (18)	2.33 (9)	1.60 (10)

Crime/Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls

In Table 58 the cell means are presented for substantial 2-way interactions between length of jobs held and non-labour market variables on crime/drug involvement. Here we find the greatest number of 2-way interaction effects. The first four interaction effects tabled do conform to social control theory expectations, whereas the final one does not.

The first and second interactions are for length of jobs by the respondents' economic status by total and property crime, respectively. Here we see that dropouts low on both labour and non-labour social control have the highest rate of criminal involvement, approximately twice that of dropouts low on only one or high on both of these measures (0.73 and 0.67 for interaction one and two, respectively). The third interaction is for length of jobs held by the attachment index on violent crime. Again dropouts low on both social control measures have much higher crime rated than any of the other dropouts (0.18).

This pattern repeats itself when we examine the interaction between length of jobs held and the non-labour market social control (get more education) on drug use. Dropouts low on both of these social controls have the highest drug use values of all respondents tabled (2.41). The final 2-way interaction is for length of jobs held by future occupation selected by drug use. Here we find the exact opposite to what social control theory would predict.

Dropouts low on both of these social controls have the lowest, not highest, rate of drug use.

Knowing whether respondents had selected a specific future occupation also added little to our understanding of the relationship between current labour market status and drug use. These two findings question the validity of our construction of this variable as a measure of social control, at least based upon the quantitative data available. In the following closing section of this chapter we comment further on the validity of measures in this chapter.

TABLE 58

Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Length of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions

2-way Interactions			
		High S.C.	Low S.C.
(1) Length job by R's $ status by total crime			
		Some Long	Short Only
	High S.C.	0.44 (51)	0.36 (38)
	Low S.C.	0.26 (16)	0.73 (20)
(2) Length job by R's $ status by property crime			
		Some Long	Short Only
	High S.C.	0.30 (51)	0.27 (38)
	Low S.C.	0.24 (16)	0.67 (20)
(3) Length job by attachment (index) by violent crime			
		Some Long	Short Only
	High S.C.	0.09 (45)	0.05 (31)
	Low S.C.	0.03 (20)	0.18 (26)
(4) Length job by get more education by drugs			
		Some Long	Short Only
	High S.C.	1.96 (47)	1.49 (39)
	Low S.C.	1.11 (18)	2.41 (17)
(5) Length job by future occupation selected by drugs			
		Some Long	Short Only
	High S.C.	1.80 (45)	1.98 (45)
	Low S.C.	1.67 (21)	0.82 (11)

Crime/Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls

The cell means for substantial 2-way interactions between number of jobs held by non-labour market based social controls on criminal and drug involvement are presented in Table 59. There are two notable interactions, one for total crime and one for violent crime. The first interaction again conforms to the pattern of results expected from social control theory. This interaction is for number of jobs held by whether the respondent will get more education on total crime. Here we see that dropouts who were low on both the labour market and non-labour market social controls had the highest rate of involvement in total crime (0.60).

The second interaction is number of jobs held by the conventional association index on violent crime. Here we see that, contrary to the predictions of social control theory, it was dropouts who were high on both social controls who had the highest rate of violent crime (0.16). Dropouts low on both social controls were moderately high on violent crime (0.10).

TABLE 59

Cell Means for Crime/Drug Involvement by Number of Jobs Held by Non-Labour Market Social Controls: 2-way Interactions

2-way Interactions			
		High S.C.	Low S.C.
(1) Number of Jobs Held by get more education by total crime			
		1-3	4(+)
	High S.C.	0.38 (45)	0.43 (42)
	Low S.C.	0.23 (22)	0.60 (17)
(2) Number of jobs held by conventional associations (index) by violent crime			
		1-3	4(+)
	High S.C.	0.16 (37)	0.02 (31)
	Low S.C.	0.05 (33)	0.10 (28)

One reaction to finding the highest rate of violent crime among dropouts high on both the labour market and non-labour market control, is to question the validity of our measures. Perhaps dropouts who have had only a few jobs since leaving high school are really lower, not

higher, on labour market success than dropouts who have had four or more jobs. But then the previous interaction effect does not support the control theory prediction. Moreover, it is difficult to see how dropouts who were most likely to engage in sports, hobbies and volunteer work, eminently conventional activities, could be misconstrued as not being high on conventional behavior, and thus social controls. On the other hand, given the large number of analyses done in this chapter it is possible to get some significant results simply by chance. This deviant interaction could have occurred in just that fashion. [61]

In summary, as can be seen from the data presented in this chapter, non-labour market social controls are occasionally related by themselves, and in conjunction with labour market-based social controls, to crime and drug use. More important, however, is the fact that all main effects and seven out of ten 2-way interactions in this chapter turn out as we had expected. Dropouts with low labour market and low non-labour market social controls, in the majority of cases, had the highest rate of crime and illegal drug use. Thus, there is evidence here that non-labour market social controls play a substantial part in the genesis of crime and deviant behaviour among high school dropouts.

---

[61]Also given a relatively novel extension of social control theory, we can expect some minor problems with measurement validity.

VII. Qualitative Data on the Dynamics of the Out-of-School Social Control of Crime Process

In this the final data analysis chapter we analyze qualitative data contained in the interview transcripts in order to further explicate major out-of-school social control processes, or lack thereof, in the lives of dropouts. More specifically, the focus in this chapter is upon the social control of criminal involvement, the central deviance variable of concern. Cases were selected for analysis based solely upon the degree of reported criminal involvement.[69] Prior to analyzing these transcripts, let us briefly review the results of the three previous quantitative data chapters which direct our efforts in this qualitative analysis.

As we have seen in chapter 4, there are some substantial zero order relationships between dropouts' labour market integration and involvement in crime. The crime indices in particular show zero order relationships with criminal involvement, which does vary somewhat depending upon the measure of labour market integration and crime index utilized.

In chapter 5 we found, via the ANOVA analysis, substantial variation in dropouts' involvement in crime, frequently by sex and occasionally by age. We found only minimal variation in the labour market-crime index relationship by sex (two 2-way interactions) and age (one 2-way interaction).

In chapter 6, we again found a small degree of zero order variation in dropout's involvement in crime, this time for several measures of non-labour market based social control. Again depending on the measures employed, we also found some variation in the labour market integration-crime relationship by certain measures of non-labour market based social control.

To summarize, these three quantitative data analysis chapters indicate that labour market based social controls are in certain instances related to involvement in crime. However, other social controls are also apparently operative in the out-of-school social control of dropout's criminal behavior. In addition to this, the results of the analysis presented in chapter 5 indicate that in the present chapter we should be attuned to the existence of

[69]In Appendix IV the frequency of reported criminal involvement is presented for the high crime males and females analyzed in this chapter.

differences in the degree and type of out-of-school social control processes in the lives of males as opposed to females.

As a result of these research findings and the literature review presented in chapter 1, in the present chapter we shall try to determine which elements of the social bond (labour market based commitment; general commitment provided by future aspirations and socio-economic supports/relations; attachment, particularly to parents; and involvement in conventional activities) are most active in the social control of crime. One essential component of this qualitative analysis is the presentation of illustrative vignettes which reveal, in the dropouts' own words, the dynamics of the out-of-school social control process.

This analysis shall be conducted for: (i) ten randomly selected male dropouts with no reported criminal involvement, (ii) ten males with the highest degree of reported criminal involvement, (iii) ten randomly selected females with no reported criminal involvement, and finally, (iv) ten females with the highest degree of reported criminal involvement. [70]

A. Qualitative Data Analysis

A detailed reading of the interview transcripts, for all forty dropouts selected for analysis, indicated several specific and general dimensions of the social bond to be most important in the social control of crime. That is to say, these elements of the social bond generally appeared to differentiate those respondents who were heavily involved in crime from those who were not involved at all. Data are presented in Tables 60 through 63 which indicate whether or not each of these elements of the social bond were present in the lives of non-criminal males, criminal males, non-criminal females and criminal females, respectively. Before presenting these tables, however, it is necessary to briefly discuss the elements of the

[70]All criminal involvement reported in the crime questionnaire, or the lack thereof, is for the year prior to being interviewed. Dropouts may, however, discuss criminal involvement in the in-person interview which took place more than one year prior to being interviewed. We must note here that only five out of these forty respondents were interviewed by the author. Also, with only ten respondents in each of the four categories, the problem of generalizing from these data, (i) to the sample as a whole and (ii) to dropouts overall, obviously exists.

social bond listed in these tables.

Moving down the table, the first element primarily taps one dimension of labour market based social control, namely whether the respondent was currently employed full-time or currently enrolled in school full-time. A minority of the respondents were enrolled in educational programs, largely as a means of furthering their employment prospects. Thus, while not currently employed full-time, they should still be subject to greater social control than those respondents who were neither employed nor studying full-time.

The second social control element listed indicates whether respondents had developed attainable major future occupational goals. [71] Here we considered the match between the past and present behavior and life condition of respondents and the type and level of future goal indicated. One important dimension of this deliberation was whether the respondent had actually started to work toward the stated goal.

Again moving down the list of elements, we see that one particular dimension of attachment that seemed to come to the forefront as important was attachment to fathers for males and attachment to mothers for females. The two final social control elements listed indicate whether respondents were subject to significant social control due to their involvement in conventional activity and the strength of their socio-economic supports/relations.

Non-Criminal Males: The Dynamics of Social Control

Data are presented in Table 60 on the extent to which we find each of these major social control elements to exist in the lives of ten randomly selected non-criminal male dropouts. As can be seen from this table, an extremely high degree of social control existed among this group of dropouts. Only five out of a total of fifty elements of the social bonds listed were absent in their lives. In three cases we find the absence of the father-son

[71]For out-of-school dropouts attainable occupational goals were deemed to provide greater social control than occuaptional goals with little chance of being attained (cf. Hirschi, 1969:186).

attachment dimension of social control. For the last respondent listed, case #059, we see the absence of two other elements of the social bond, namely being currently full-time employed/at school and having developed occupational goals. In this case, however, there are family ties in general, including father-son attachment, involvement in conventional activity and notable socio-economic supports/relations, particularly from the family.

TABLE 60

Non-Criminal Males: Dynamics of Social Control

CASE#	089	106	111	031	122	028*	020	026	043	059
Currently F-T Employed/School	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Occupational Goals	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Father-Son Attachment	yes	yes	yes		yes		yes		yes	yes
Conventional Activity	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Socio-economic Supports/Relations	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

* Respondent #028 has developed a strong surrogate father-son relationship with a church minister, which currently acts as a major social control for this respondent.

Respondent #059 dropped out of high school almost one year ago; he was in his final year of school and needed only a few credits to graduate. Let us let him speak for himself about these crucial social control elements, and about his lack of future occupational goals:

I: In general, what do you want to do with your life?
R: I don't know. I don't really want a family. I just want to be well-off, have enough money to support myself throughout my life...
I: If you think of jobs, what kind of job in particular would you like to be doing in five or ten years?
R: Historian, but if I couldn't take that. I wouldn't mind being a policeman. If I could go back to school I would take historian.
I: Do you think you're going to go back and get these credits?
R: Well if a job comes along in three or four years I might, but I don't know right now. It's hard to say, I'm indecisive.

In terms of family attachment/support while unemployed we find:

I: Are you living at home right now?
R: Yeah with my Mom [and Dad].
I: What are you living on?
R: Just live at home, look for a job, sometimes if you want to go out on the weekend, she'll give me money.

I: Do the rest of your family help you out in any way?
R: Oh yeah, my sister is always asking her friends about jobs and my brother is quite high up in his company and he asks around as well.

One measure of attachment to family is who the respondent turns to with problems. This respondent is asked:

I: ...if you got into a real problem, do you have any special person you can turn to?
R: Besides your family?
I: Would your family do?
R: Oh yeah, our family is real close.

From these quotes it should not be surprising that this unemployed respondent, who had not yet developed future occupational goals, was nonetheless uninvolved in crime. As we have seen, other major social controls exist for this person. Let us now let two other respondents speak on the role that occupational goals and father-son attachment play in their lives.

Respondent #028 is currently enrolled in an educational upgrading program and has a permanent part-time job, 20 hours per week, as a cook at a fast food chain store. He has currently well developed goals - he wants to be a technician in electronics. Yet things have not always been so rosy in this dropout's life. He has been repeatedly unemployed, comes from a broken home, and has been involved in crime prior to the present year. In terms of the respondent's past life, we see little social control from father-son attachment specifically and family attachment in general:

I: ...tell me a little about your family. How do you get along with them?
R: ...my family, we were distant, having no father willing to put some time and effort into it. There was no love and concern.
I: How about your mom?
R: Yeah, my Mom, there was like a second Father but he wasn't the best... She didn't express her love and concern, though. As a family we were distant...

The lack of social control in the more distant past from employment with some "future" is also indicated:

I: Okay let's talk a little bit about when you were unemployed, how did that affect your health, if you think it did.
R: Ah it was dreadful. I needed to find a job that was going to be able to help me — something that was going to more than existing. The job I had wasn't ... had no quality, the bowling alley that I worked in had no quality. I wasn't getting anything out of it.

Similarly, the lack of social control which arises from the combination of lack of meaningful employment, no family support, and no future occupational goals is well expressed in the following quotes:

R: When I... you know where I was at with no job and such, I didn't care, I had no care at all. I think even a little would have been helpful.

R: I was emotionally breaking down, I didn't care, I had nothing to hang onto, and there was no one there to back me up, give me confidence, to help me over the rough periods. I had no father. I had reached out to just anything knowing that where I was at was no good and anything else could be better.

This respondent subsequently finds a surrogate father-son attachment with a church minister. He currently lives with the minister and his wife as a special boarder. When asked about finally getting his life together, this respondent states:

R: He [the minister] put in a lot of time helping me, he still is actually. We took some time to sit down together, work out some of the personal problems that I had to deal with, change my attitude toward work, my motivation and such, we worked that out. He helped me with working out a resume...

I: So, ah, are you getting any other help financially?
R: Ah, not really. I'm in debt right now, because the people I'm living with are kind, they're nice, they're not forcing me to pay money I owe them, you know at the end of the month if I don't have the money it's okay.

In terms of the current development of future occupational goals, we may quote respondent #028 when he states of the latter part of his life that:

R: I know I needed a High School Diploma, so I came here [school] and got involved, made a commitment, and they told me I needed to have a [specific] goal set.
R: So I had to be realistic and start thinking I have to choose something that I would like, there's actually something out there I could like. Someone suggested let's be realistic instead of looking at a job that you picked out of the air, look at something where your strengths are.

Respondent #122 is currently working in an old folks home as an assistant in the dietary department. This is not a very high status or well paying job but the respondent sees the chance for career development in an area he likes — working with people. When asked how he obtained this job the respondent stated:

R: ...I've always been interested in working in a hospital environment and I went out on my own and decided to apply at some old folks homes.
I: How about problems that you had when you were looking for work?
R: Um, there's problems when you don't have money and you're broke but it's a different situation for me cause I live at home and don't pay rent.

In terms of father-son attachment and family support in general we find this respondent stating that:

I: And your Dad wasn't totally upset that you left school?
R: Disappointed but not upset.
I: He places a lot of value on education.
R: Exactly, my Dad is a well-educated man, and it's important to him. When I'm ready to do it, I'll go and finish.

I: So how do you think your family helps you out?
R: With support, ideas, definitely love, that's about it.

In terms of the respondent's occupational goal development, it is instructive to quote this dropout when he is asked:

I: When you were unemployed do you think it affected your health at all?
R: Yeah, I think it did. Being unemployed and sitting around all day is depressing, um you have no fulfillment of what you're doing. You have no direction.

I: Okay let's talk about your major goals in life.
R: Well what I want to do is stick with this job for a couple of years. I want to take some night courses, finish my High School in September and from there I'm thinking of University or N.A.I.T.. My first step is through high school and then I can make a decision on what I want to do.

I: In five or ten years what kind of job do you see yourself at?
R: I want to get a job where I'm working with people, um, helping people instead of the regular nine to five. I was thinking of a social worker cause I basically know what that is about.
I: How likely do you think it is that you will be able to do that?
R: Good, very good chance.

We have outlined in the respondents' own words some of the dynamics of the out-of-school social control of crime among this group of non-criminal male dropouts. Two points need to be mentioned here.

From analyzing the transcripts it would appear that one cannot single out any of these major elements of the social bond as the most important in the lives of dropouts. That is to say, these major social controls appear to be fairly interdependent rather than existing as seperate elements of social control. In the following chapter we shall comment further on the interrelationship between elements of the social bond when we present a detailed model of the

social control of crime process. Second, quite obviously, consistent with the logic of social control theory, it is very understandable why these dropouts did not report committing a single crime in the period under consideration.

Criminal Males: The Dynamics of Social Control

In Table 61 data are presented on the extent to which we find each of the listed major social control elements to exist in the lives of the ten most criminal males in the sample of dropouts. [72] The global social control picture presented in this table is very different from that which existed for the ten non-criminal males. Among this group of dropouts we find a very low presence (not absence) of these major social controls. Specifically, we find forty out of fifty major social control elements to be missing in the lives of these dropouts.

As is obvious from this table these highly criminal dropouts are, as a group, quite unlikely to be employed or at school full-time. They are also quite unlikely to have developed occupational goals, or to have significant father-son attachment in their recent lives. These dropouts are a little, but not much, more likely to be involved in conventional activities. When we come to socio-economic supports/relations, we see that half of these dropouts do report having fairly strong socio-economic supports/relations, usually attributable to their family. It would appear that the limited conventional activity and socio-economic supports/relations in these dropout's lives, if present, were not sufficient to offset the loss of other major social controls. [73]

---

[72]Criminal involvement for these high crime male dropouts ranged from 14 to 285 offences in the year prior to interview.

[73]The problem of maturation out of crime in the absence of integration into the central work world must be noted. Such respondents likely do move up in the marginal work world over time. In addition, marriage, the mean age of which is 24 years, should also come into play.

TABLE 61

Criminal Males: Dynamics of Social Control

CASE #	053	116	073	078	065	017	013	049	054	044
Currently F-T Employed/School						yes				
Occupational Goals									yes	
Father-Son Attachment					yes					
Conventional Activity		yes		yes						
Socio-economic Supports/Relations			yes		yes	yes		yes	yes	

Let us turn to an anlaysis of the interview transcripts and crime questionnaires for these respondents in order to flesh out the dynamics of the social control of crime process.

Respondent #078 left school in grade twelve, approximately two and one half years ago. The reason for his dropping out was that he had been sent to jail for one month. This put him so far behind that he found it too difficult to write final examinations.

An analysis of the involvement in crime questionnaire for this respondent reveals one non-traffic offence conviction in the previous year. This respondent also reports having broken into a car or building on fifteen occasions; selling illegal drugs ten times; both attacking someone with a weapon and getting into a fight just for fun on five occasions; and theft under fifty dollars ten times. The number of reported criminal offences here totals forty-five.

Let us now let case #078 speak for himself on the interrelationship between family support, particularly father-son attachment, and the development of occupational goals or, as is the case here, the lack thereof. [14] When asked why do some kids have jobs while others

[14]The interview transcript for respondent #065 was not chosen for analysis, even though this was the only high-crime respondent analysed who had notable father-son attachment. The primary reason for this was that this respondent was somewhat

don't he replies:

R: Probably it goes right back to the original — the original thing or things that have started a person off wrong in life, and I'm talking about young — like for example in my own life, when my father died, things just went — downhill from there. There was no control in my life, there was no father to give you a beating when you needed a beating you know. So, like that's — that's really essentially why I'm sitting here talking to a tape recorder, because I don't have a father. My father died about 7 years ago ...

R: ...Some people have jobs they probably has a good — a good childhood more — a good, good, good, feelings from their life when it was most important in adolescence. That's when probably the factor is most important, what you're going to do with your life.

The crucial support role that father-attachment plays in creating and sustaining a dropout's quest for integration into the labour market is revealed when respondent #078 was asked about major problems he has had in looking for work. This dropout responded:

R: OK, for example, people would say OK, you've got to keep on forgetting — like if you go in a store and someone says no, don't let it get you down, keep on going, — well I tried, its not possible. Especially, especially not for long periods of time. Like you can maybe — if you've a very strong will keep a good attitude going for a week. If you're strong willed and you have absolutely no training skills and you're out looking for it — and you have nothing that you can lean back on in say a month's time when you have no luck on anything. When you have absolutely no future and it just depends solely on yourself and you've had no luck in yourself so far as before, you don't have too much confidence in yourself and its very difficult to take people's advice and use it constructively all the time.

Let us next consider this respondent's labour market success to date and his goals for the future. Respondent #078 has recently been unsuccessful at getting a job in even the minimum wage sales/service area. He has been in and out of the usual run of low paying jobs held by youth — fast food sales to telephone soliciting. He is currently enrolled in a job finders program. He has completed similar programs in the past, with little avail in terms of obtaining a job with any career prospects or getting major occupational goals underway.

With little occupational success behind him and no substantive occupational /educational goals actually set-up, this respondent none the less states that his goal in life is:

R: My goal in life is to win, win, win.

When asked to comment on his main goals in life, this respondent replied:

---

[74](cont'd) equivocal about this stated attachment and it did not appear to be an overly salient factor in the respondent's life. Respondent #078 provided much more information on the interplay between this and other social control elements and involvement in crime.

R: My main goals, in order of one to the immediately, well immediately after this program to get a job, save up some money perhaps, go to school, um always to keep on looking for bigger and better things and to eventually complete my grade twelve and go into a post secondary after saving up some money in a job.

This respondent obviously has aspirations for the future but they are vague, somewhat grandiose and as of yet not on-line. The only really immediate goal is to get a job, virtually any job, after completing this job club program. This respondent may or may not go on to achieve some stable, relatively successful labour market integration. However, at the present it can not be said that this respondent has developed major occupational goals with the attendant social controls.

The central criminogenic role that the lack of social controls played in this respondent's life, was well illustrated when the respondent was asked at the end of the interview if he would like to talk about getting into trouble with the law. [75]

I: ...what sort of things happened when you got in trouble with the law?

R: I didn't pay attention in school so my mind wasn't occupied in school as much as it should have been. So when I was with my friends we were always looking for things to occupy that space and excitement was the main thing. I was not in sports, neither were any of my friends we also needed physical relief, right. So we needed things to do. We did a lot of crazy kiddy things, kiddish things like climbing on rooftops or buildings and not really vandalism per se as breaking windows or anything but they called it vandalism because we were on public buildings ... We ended up going from step to step and we ended up doing B and E's on peoples houses...

Let us now consider the social controls, or virtually total lack thereof, in the life of respondent #013. This respondent is quite young, now only sixteen, but he has seen a lot in the past year or so. His mother is a lawyer, his father an architect. Yet he has virtually no contact with his mother, and none with his father after getting kicked out of the house at age fourteen. The respondent states the reason to be that he wanted to be a mechanic and they

[75] Many respondents interpreted this question as asking them to elaborate upon official criminal justice system contact as opposed to how and why they committed criminal acts in the first place. In addition, the reference period here for criminal involvement, unlike the crime questionnaire, was not just for the year prior to being interviewed. Criminal involvement discussed in the interview was thus not necessarily the same as that admitted in the questionnaire.

strenuously objected, presumably favouring a more professional career. Subsequent to getting kicked out by his parents the respondent dropped out of school, as he was not able to provide for himself and also attend school. He is currently a "crasher" at a local emergency youth shelter.

The lack of social control in this respondent's life, from both school and family, is well indicated by the fact that this respondent has one of the highest rates of criminal involvement in the previous year among the sample of dropouts, two hundred and sixteen reported offences. The respondent also reports being questioned as a suspect about some crime by police on fifty occasions and reports six criminal convictions in this period. In terms of specific offences the respondent reports: breaking into a car or building on thirty occasions; shoplifting ninety-six times [*]; selling illegal drugs forty times; using physical force to get money on fifteen occasions; theft under fifty dollars five times and theft over fifty dollars twenty times.

The lack of family attachment in general, father-son attachment in particular, and the lack of general familial socio-economic supports/relations is well indicated in the following conversation:

I: Okay, maybe I can ask you a little about how you get along with your family?
R: I don't, I'm at the point of filing charges at my mother.
I: Oh, really.
R: She pulled a knife on me, so I gotta ??? in my Dad's closet.
I: And, she called the police then, or?
R: Yeah, well she's a lawyer, eh, so she got away scott free and ended up on a suspended sentence...
I: Well, how often do you get together with your parents?
R: Um, my Dad's in Los Angeles right now.
I: are they seperated or divorced?
R: I don't know, I couldn't tell you. It's none of my business.

The extreme difficulty of developing a successful conventional career and life without parental support in adolescence is well indicated when respondent #013 is querried about why he left school and then about his life on the street:

I: Um, I guess the first question is why did you leave school?
R: Well, I couldn't really hack it. I've been on my own since I was fourteen, right that's

[*]Response frequencies for specific offences were capped at 96, frequencies greater than this were coded at this maximum value. The problem of retroactively recalling crime, of course, means that these are approximate frequencies.

when I got kicked out, and I got to grade ten, kinda living off the streets, getting into a lot of trouble, like going to jail 'cause I was stealing things like food and clothes, you name it. That's why I dropped out.

I: Okay, would you like to talk about some of the trouble that you've had and so on?

R: I've got anything from theft under $200 to $2,400.

The respondent is asked to further elaborate on his criminal involvement, to which he replies:

R: Well, when I was Calgary, I didn't really have anyplace to go or anything like that, and I, so I was hanging around with a gang, and because there was enough of us, we got into a lot of things, right, so I was with them, so I was guaranteed that, like, if were ???? some drugs, I got a piece of the money and I could buy whatever the things I needed. We did B & E and we got $25,000 worth of stereos and furniture and things like that, and I always got a cut out of it and it ended up bringing me down fast. Um I was kinda known as the "school boy" 'cause I realized that my education was important but ah, I went out and got a job after it. But's that is why I dropped out of school.

The truth of the statement, that the respondent wanted to pursue his education and become a mechanic, as well as the harsh reality of life on the street, was indicated when the respondent was asked about skipping school prior to dropout:

R: Not really, I went to school as often as I could, like, I wouldn't really call it skipping like kids skip to go to an arcade. I'd skip 'cause I was beat up really bad or something like that, like because I hadn't eaten for a while and I decided I was going to go find some place to eat or sleep, if I hadn't had any sleep for awhile. I used to do things like [break into] houses when the development went under and the doors and windows and everything were on, but the insides weren't finished, I used to take insulation and throw plastic over top of it and throw a blanket on top of that, and that's where we used to sleep...

To which he adds:

R: ...but, If I could have stayed home, I would have graduated. I was living in a place where I didn't have to worry about where I'm going to eat, what I'm going to wear.

Respondent #013 states that as a result of this lack of family support and education:

R: ...the goal I want to get at is way out of reach now because there's no way I'm gonna get on as a ??? mechanic. I can do it, I can pull a motor apart and put it back together again, but I ain't got that piece of paper that says that.

The almost totally goalless nature of the respondent's current life is well reflected when he is asked about how he spends his day, particularly his activities with his friends. For here the respondent states:

R: I don't know...fool around, get into itty bits of trouble, like I said, ??? I don't know hang around the mall, go to a party ??? like around here, you never plan your life, like its not even day by day. You might be here one day and not the next, I don't care, I don't have any plans.

Respondent #049, who is currently unemployed and lives at home, shows a similar pattern of lack of major social controls. We also see an extremely high (the highest in the sample of dropouts) number of criminal offences reported by this respondent in the crime questionnaire, two hundred and eight-five offences. In addition this respondent reports being questioned by the police as a suspect in some crime on twenty-eight occasions and being convicted of a criminal offence four times. In terms of specific criminal offences we find the respondent admitting: shoplifting ninety-six times; selling illegal drugs forty times; using physical force to get money five times; attacking someone with a weapon on nine occasions; getting into a fight just for fun fourteen times; damaging or destroying property once; theft under fifty dollars seventy-five times and theft over fifty dollars twenty times.

An analysis of the interview transcript for this respondent demonstrates the low degree of social control in this respondent's life. Here are some selected quotes which focus on the lack of parental attachment, lack of occupational goals and little involvement in conventional activity.

I: Okay, let's talk a little bit about who you're living with now?
R: Folks.
I: Mom and Dad?
R: Yeah, I have no brothers or sisters. I was supposed to be kicked out the day I turned eighteen. I nearly got kicked out the other day for a long distance phone call that I didn't bother telling my folks about. I get into some pretty good screamin' fights with the old lady...
I: ... how do you get along with your mom and dad?
R: Well, things are basically touch and go. If I'm out of the house or I'm in the room with my door shut, things are okay.

I: How many [job applications] would you generally fill out in a week?
R: Well, I don't go out job hunting that often, but when I do, I would say about ten or so 'cause there's nothing I'm really interested in. I'm trying to stay out of the restaurants.

R: Um, when I was in school I had all these dreams, but in actuality, you get out of school and find out where it's at. Everybody thinks as soon as they get out of school they're going to get a job, that's bogus.
I: So overall what would you like to do with your life?
R: Um, something along the line of either getting into the technical field, something along the line of electronics would be fun or driving.

I: Okay, lets talk a little bit about what you do when you're not looking for work, entertainment wise and that kind of stuff, who do you do it with and where do you go?
R: Mostly, like I'm not a super-heavy partier, but if someone even mentions party, I say 'where?', let's crash it. If I get invited I'm there.
I: Who do you spend your time with?
R: I had a really good friend who moved up to Whitehorse with his folks... We'd go out,

go to West Edmonton Mall or just walk around downtown, stay there and get into trouble.

I: How about other friends, how often do you get together with them?
R: As many times as I can.
I: And what kinds of things would you do with them.
R: Party, more party, and get into trouble.

At the end of his interview this respondent was asked to elaborate upon "any trouble you've gotten into with the law". From the respondent's reply to this question it is not too difficult to see why this respondent had the highest rate of reported criminal involvement in the sample of dropouts.

R: Well, in the beginning when I was fifteen, I did my first B and E, did three of them, got caught for the fourth one.
I: Breaking into a house?
R: Yeah, the stupid jerk came home just as I was walking out... and got into trouble awhile ago for mischief, like I was taking these rocks off Argyll & 99th and hucking them at cars. At the time I was caught, I had some Big Whites, a few skin mags, I had some drugs on me, I had quite a few things on me that were illegal. Then I got busted and the cops didn't read me any sort of rights, then we were halfway to the copshop and I said 'Oh by the way, I hope you guys know you're under arrest', you know. Got into trouble at the University, I was just walking around, decided to go into the men's changeroom and check wallets. Got absolutely nothing. Couple of guys came walking out and caught us, got busted for that...
I: How did you get involved with these things?
R: What I would call friends at that time but now if I see this one guy again, I'll kick his head in.
I: How about, now that you've got alot of free time on your hands, do you think that contributes to this kind of thing?
R: Um, uh huh.
I: It has in your own case?
R: Well, out of sheer boredom, I went to the store with a friend and we got busted for ripping off a couple of tapes each. Fortunately, my friend had stuffed the tapes down his pants and the security guy didn't check there. Like this jacket, here, it has a slit, that's for a knife, it's a knife pocket. In another jacket I had pockets for chucks, mohogany chucks, good, heavy, solid wood. I've got busted for chucks, I've got busted for fighting downtown. I've got busted about fourteen times, most of them were dropped once it went to court, B & E's, theft under, criminal mischief. I've had many knives taken away from me and stuff like that.

The lack of major social controls, as listed in Table 61, in the lives of these highly criminal dropouts, as opposed to the non-criminal male dropouts, should be quite apparent from these illustrative quotes.

In the following section we analyze and compare the dynamics of the out-of-school social control process in the lives of non-criminal and criminal female dropouts in the sample.

Non-Criminal Females: The Dynamics of Social Control

Table 62 shows whether the same major social control elements are found in the lives of ten randomly selected non-criminal females. Like their male counterparts, these non-criminal females generally had many social controls present in their out-of-school life, collectively missing only nine out of fifty major social controls. Only two of the ten females were not currently employed/at school full-time, and only one female did not have notable mother-daughter atttachment. The one main exception to this general pattern is the absence of major occupational goals on the part of six of the ten respondents. This stands out all the more sharply given the strong presence of occupational goals among non-criminal males (nine out of ten respondents). It would appear, as Gomme (1986) has suggested, that the development of occupational goals is not as crucial a dimension in the social control dynamics for female dropouts.

TABLE 62

Non-Criminal Females: Dynamics of Social Control

CASE #	091	082	046	118	158	135	142	152	127	099
Currently F-T Employed/School	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Occupational Goals	yes	yes				yes				yes
Mother-Daughter Attachment	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Conventional Activity		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Socio-economic Supports/Relations	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Let us again refer to the interview transcripts in order to show, in the respondents' own words, the dynamics of the out-of-school social control process for non-criminal females.

Respondent #082 quit school about one year ago while in grade 10. Since then she has been in and out of restaurant and sales clerk jobs, which she explicitly states to be quite undesirable employment. She has developed an extremely strong desire to move up into a better quality job. In order to achieve this she has made a distinct effort to get into an adult education program, and has definite plans to attend university. Her father and mother are divorced, and her mother, while not having a lot of spare money, strongly supports her daughter morally and emotionally.

Let us first quote the respondent when she notes the undesireability and consequences of working in dead-end jobs, which are in large part the only jobs currently available to many youths in general, and dropouts in particular. Speaking of her restaurant work and employment in general, she states:

R: I worked in the back and I hated it because I was washing dishes and I didn't have any respect for myself and I didn't like myself, I didn't like what I was doing, I didn't like anything about my life at the time. I started getting really suicidal ideas and then I thought 'God, why am I doing this?' and then I got fired from there 'cause I was always, always late 'cause I really didn't like the job. So I got fired from there and then about a week later after that I got hired at the Superstore and the pay was good but that was it. I didn't like working there either.

R: For the past year or so, the reasons for my depression are either I'm not making enough money in this job, I'm not enjoying my job, or I'm not working so therefore I'm not secure in anything.

Although recently enrolled in an upgrading program, this respondent had been unsuccessfully looking for work. The crucial moral support provided by this respondent's mother is reported:

R: Yeah well things were really, really bad for me last week, I was feeling really depressed. I've written out so many applications that I know them off by heart and nothing ever happens and I can't figure out why. I was getting so low and I went to see my mom and she just knows when I'm depressed. She'll look at me and say 'Hi, what's wrong', no matter what I say or do.

The strong mother-daughter attachment is further clarified when the respondent is asked:

I: Um, when you have a real problem who do you turn to?
R: My Mom, always.
I: She gives you good advice.
R: She's great. I don't know what I would do if I didn't have her. She's the greatest thing that ever happened in my life.

In terms of the development of future occupational goals, we find that this respondent has decided to attend university, majoring in Arts, although no one area of specialization has yet been picked out:

I: Tell me what your major goals are in life?
R: Right now I want to finish off some courses and then go into university.
I: What do you want to study?
R: I want to go into the Faculty of Arts. I haven't really decided on exactly what I want to do.

I: Do you think you're going to stick with AVC [Alberta Vocational College]? Tell me the route, how do you perceive your route?
R: Well, I've seen a counsellor and she's told me all the courses I need to get to where I want to go so I'm going to take that and right into University which should take about two years.

The respondent's commitment to furthering her occupational career through education is well indicated when she states that:

R: I had to sell some things to get into this class. I had to sell a ring that was very important to me, I had to sell that to get enrolled 'cause otherwise I wouldn't have gotten in because the classes go really fast.

The next respondent (#118) had quit school twice. She dropped out for 8 months, went back for part of a year, and has currently been out of school for 4 months. She is now only seventeen and lives at home with her mother. Her parents are divorced. She has basically been unemployed since leaving school, on both occasions. Moreover, until recently she had made essentially no effort to find employment. The primary reason for this was that she had been content to party with her friends and to live at home with her mother supporting her.

Even in the absence of any major job search, she does, however, have a fairly accurate picture of the negative employment prospects open to many young people. The respondent has currently found a job at McDonalds and states that while the work is not great, she enjoys being busy after such a long period of doing nothing. Her attachment to her mother figures prominently here. She enjoys working at even a low pay/status job at McDonalds as it makes her mother proud of her, at last. Indeed her mother was instrumental in getting her the job as her mother saw the Help Wanted ad and drove the respondent to apply for the job.

Right now the respondent has no major future employment goals and is happy just to have a job which gives her some money and relieves her guilt over disappointing and living off her mother. While unemployed she went out with her friends but did not drink excessively or do drugs, except for some occasional marijuana. The crucial anti-criminogenic past and present social control role that mother-daughter attachment played in this respondent's life is highlighted when the respondent is asked about her current employment:

I: OK. And you're working now.
R: Yes, full-time. Finally. It's not much. I don't get much money but at least my mom's happy enough that I'm working.
R: I know she would support me but it was like, I felt such guilt towards the fact that I was living off her to begin with you know when she's working so hard she's you know killing herself into the ground to support me and her and keep the house and a lot of kids they take advantage of their parents, — everybody takes advantage of their parents, I still do, you know my mom is always there for me sort of thing but its like — you don't, once you drop out of school you think 'well gee, I've got all this freedom, do what you want you know and you — like I said I went for a year, doing absolutely nothing and then the second year I got away with a lot too and stuff but I mean I've grown, I'm hoping at least that I've grown out of that stage. [77]

The critical role that family support, in this case from her mother, plays in dropouts' lives even when they do obtain employment is indicated by this respondent's additional comments:

R: So now with me working like I've taken a big burden off of her as it is so now that she doesn't have to. I mean I don't — she still supports me a lot more — like she still pays for a lot of other stuff that I — I can't afford at the moment but she's there for everything else. I couldn't imagine not, you know, what I would do if she were to suddenly leave or — you know, God forbid die or something but... I couldn't survive on the salary I'm making now.

This respondent still has no major future goals. She notes that she is interested in an animal care career, but also in computers for, as she says, that's where everyone is going. However, upon reflection she states:

R: ...But as for what I want to do, its so far in the future right now I mean, I'm just sort of — all I can think about is to right now I've got to piece my life together and get everything settled so that I'm comfortable with working because its going to take me quite a while for me to get used to getting up and working all day...

---

[77]When asked about getting into any trouble with the law in the in-person interview, the respondent reported little criminal involvement in her lifetime. The exceptions were shoplifting once at age thirteen and occasionally drinking under the legal age.

Respondent #135 has been out of school for about 4 years. She states that she wasn't skipping school a lot, but she wasn't getting anything out of it and getting a job seemed a better alternative. She has been employed in a variety of jobs, none of which have lasted over a year. Yet she has not had a long period of unemployment. The one exception was when her own daughter was born about a year ago. [78] She currently lives common-law with her fiance and daughter. He is currently working full-time and she is attending an employment training program.

In terms of her own mother/father, there is essentially no interaction. She was adopted by a family which was very strict and non-supportive of her when support was needed in the past. Immediately after dropping out of school she moved away from home and entered a period of shifting employment and moderate involvement in deviant behavior. According to this respondent, settling into her current family life with a daughter, and developing future occupational goals, had been crucial components in the development of a more responsible less deviant life-style.

Let us cut into the interview at the point where the respondent is discussing the lack of these social controls in her previous life, and their presence today:

I: And how about when you're unemployed? Do you think there's any relationship there between being unemployed and doing something illegal?

R: Um hm. Yeah, uh, I think you're unemployed and your attitude and; your uh, psychological feelings about yourself and everything go right down the bottom. Um, if you're single. OK, there's a difference there. Because I was unemployed when I was single too, before my daughter was born. Things you do when you're unemployed are a lot different than if you have um, security and employment somewhere.

I: So when you were unemployed and single, did you think about doing things illegally or uh, had you grown out of that sort of? Friends and that sort of thing?

R: No, I was still in with the same group of people. This all happened too, trouble with the cops and drugs and drinking and stuff like that — that was when I was unemployed and single.

I: And this last time that you were unemployed you —feel different— because you have a family, your own family?

R: Yeah definitely, I had a secure — a secure home life, um, I was taken care of — I had responsibilities and that really changes a lot for most people. [79]

---

[78]While not a respondent-mother attachment like the others described above, this element of attachment was considered to be a major social control in this respondent's life.

[79]While potentially a leading question, this was asked of the respondent toward the end of the interview, when she had already discussed the central role of her new

Apart from the direct social control function of family attachment, including attachment to her own daughter, there is a major impact of these elements on the genesis of future occupational goals. At the end of the interview, the respondent volunteers the following observation:

I: I guess that's about the end of the interview, unless you'd like to add anything...
R: I just, I really feel strongly that if you um, if you are unemployed and you don't have goals, you've lost sight of your goals when you're unemployed, um you need, you need a lot of — lot of security, a lot of pushing, from your friends, from your peers, from your family if you have one, you need — a lot of a — a good boost from them, to get you goals in sight again 'cause I think that's the biggest thing that happens to people who are unemployed — like you look on 97th street stuff like that. Sure they may be supported by the government money, UIC, but their goals, they've lost their goals a long time ago and that — that's where they'll stay.

In terms of the respondent's own goals, we find her stating that the job obtained through her work program has a lot of potential for the future:

I: ...Are you working right now as part of the program?
R: Yup.
I: And what are you doing?
R: Physiotherapy aide. That's what I'm going to train as.
I: And do you have any dislikes or likes about the job?
R: I totally like it. It's very informative and uh, I don't know, the working situation is very good.
I: And do you think there's any chance of you — um, getting hired on afterwards?
R: Definitely.
I: Looks good.
R: Yup.

This respondent was also questioned about her goals in life. One important question of direct relevance to the present discussion of goal development was the following:

I: And do you think that your goals have changed at all since you found this job now?
R: Oh yeah. Um, I don't know, before you get the job you've got such extreme, extreme goals like you want to be — whatever your imagination takes you right. And with a job with the stability of getting trained in something you like, your goals seem to be more realistic. They change.

Respondent #135 noted that she has also applied to the RCMP as a recruit. She states that she has all the qualifications and that this is her first career choice. Prudently, or realistically, the respondent notes that the physiotherapy aide job is also a desireable back-up in case her RCMP plans do not materialize. Essentially this respondent would now appear to be well on her way to a more law-abiding conventional life.

---

[79](cont'd) family in her life.

Criminal Females: The Dynamics of Social Control

In Table 63, data are presented on the extent to which we find each of these five major elements of social control in the lives of the ten most criminally involved females in the sample. [10] As a group, these high crime females generally had few of these social controls present in their life, missing thirty-three out of a possible fifty social controls. While the difference betwen non-criminal and criminal respondents is not as great as that for males, we nonetheless do see a similar picture. Consistent with the predictions of social control theory, highly criminal dropouts, male and female, report many fewer social controls in their lives.

As compared to non-criminal female dropouts, the high crime females were a little less likely to be currently employed or enrolled in school full-time. They were also less likely to have developed future occupational goals. In addition, these female dropouts were much less likely to be involved in conventional activity or to have major socio-economic supports or relationships. The most notable difference between the two groups, however, centres on the existence of substantial mother-daughter attachment. While only two out of ten non-criminal females did not have notable mother-daughter attachment, only two out of ten high crime females did report such attachment.

Half of the ten female respondents were missing all five major social controls, one was missing three, one was missing two and three were missing only one. Individual high crime female dropouts were thus more likely than their male counterparts to have major social controls present in their out-of-school lives. However, as the overall rate of criminal involvement by the high crime females is low relative to that for the high crime males, we might expect these criminal female dropouts to still show a moderate presence of social controls. Nonetheless, we did not expect to observe the presence of as many major social control elements among individual high crime female dropouts. [11] We have discussed in this

---

[10]The frequency of involvement in crime for these high crime females is nowhere near as high as that for high crime males. The number of offences for these females ranged from five to thirty-one, in the one year period prior to interview.
[11]Given this unexpected finding, we shall analyze the interview transcripts for these high crime respondents in some greater detail than was generally the case previously in this chapter.

chapter the centrality of occupational goal development and mother-daughter attachment in the social control process. It is thus important to note that each of the high crime — high social control females (#s 083, 165 and 162) is missing at least one of these two major social controls.

TABLE 63

Criminal Females: Dynamics of Social Control

CASE #	055	083	074	165	114	162	070	018	022	167
Currently F-T Employed/School		yes		yes		yes			yes	yes
Occupational Goals				yes					yes	
Mother-Daughter Attachment		yes				yes				
Conventional Activity		yes		yes		yes			yes	
Socio-economic Supports/Relations		yes		yes		yes				yes

In our examination of the interview transcripts, we shall focus upon three cases with varying degrees of social control (0, 2, and 4 out of 5 controls present, respectively).

Respondent #074 has been out of school for approximately a year and one half. She quit school because her father told her to go out and look for work or he would kick her out of the house in one week. She did not find work and he did kick her out. She reports that she was not skipping school and was doing alright in terms of grades, though she had problems on both of these fronts two years previously. She is currently unemployed; she had to quit her job as a busgirl in a restaurant as she was sentenced to approximately three and a half months in a youth correctional facility for theft. She has been in this facility for the past three weeks. In the interview the respondent states that she had another theft conviction previously and received probation.

In the period since leaving school she has had one other job, babysitting. Social services had been paying an allowance to the respondent's aunt to keep the respondent. The respondent has, moreover, been in a government-sponsored group home from age twelve to sixteen. The respondent stated that she would not go back to regular school, but as she will turn eighteen in about six months she is planning to go back to an adult upgrading program.

This respondent reported being questioned by police as a suspect for some crime on six occasions, and reported being convicted for one criminal offence, presumably the just-noted prior conviction for theft. The respondent also reported shoplifting twice, theft under fifty dollars once, and theft over fifty dollars twice. Here we see a total of only five offences, the lowest frequency among high crime females.

Moving next to an analysis of the social controls in this respondent's life, let us cut into the interview transcript when she was being asked about how well she got along with her family. There was some evidence of mother-daughter interaction/attachment but this was only minimal.

I: You said you've lived in group homes since you were twelve, do you have a family in Edmonton?
R: Yeah.
I: How well do you get along with your family?
R: I only get along with mom, nobody else.
I: How often do you see your family?
R: Not often since the last couple of months. I saw my mother today.
I: Say in the three months that you were working as a busgirl, how often did you actually see any of your family?
R: Hardly ever.

One replacement for family attachment and interaction for this respondent was her involvement with her friends. Unfortunately, most of her friends were engaged in little conventional activity, including employment. One measure of this interaction/attachment was evident when the respondent was asked:

I: When things aren't working out and you have a real problem is there someone you can turn to?
R: George.
I: Is he your roommate.
R: No he's just a friend...

The small amount of conventional activity engaged in by this respondent, in conjunction with her friends, is indicated when she is asked:

I: ...when you weren't working what did you do with your time?
R: Just bummed around.
I: Bum around, what do you mean?
R: Go to see friends, visit old schools or something.

I: When you did go out and see your friends... what kind of things would you do?
R: Play arcade games, talk, smoke a joint.

I: The friends that you have, have any of them ever been unemployed?
R: Well, they're all unemployed but they don't collect unemployment. Most of them are traffickers, sell drugs or something.

Having demonstrated the lack of social controls in this respondent's life, the following excerpt in which the respondent described her own criminal involvement should come as no surprise. When we asked about any 'trouble you might have gotten into with the law', the respondent replied:

R: What did I do?
I: Well yes and that's completely optional.
R: I'm in here because my friend stole some stuff and I was with her and she didn't show up for court so I got the time.
I: How long?
R: A hundred and ten days and a $150.00 fine.
I: Is this the first time you've been charged with anything?
R: No, I had a theft before but that was when I was young [16 years old], it was stupid, I stole some cigarettes or something.
I: Did they charge you?
R: I was on probation for a few months.

Finally, let us consider the added criminogenic factor of the lack of major occupational goals in this respondent's life. She has engaged in one notable conventional activity in her past life; she is a good runner and has successfully competed in at least one local sports event. We see this sports interest emerging in a tangle of potential future careers, which have little grounding in the respondent's current reality and style of life:

I: What are your major goals in life?
R: I want to be a stewardess and I want to be in the Olympics.
I: For running?
R: Yup.
I: What kind of job would you like to have in five or ten years time?
R: I would like to be a secretary and a housewife.

Respondent #167 left school approximately one and a half years ago, while in grade twelve. She was doing so-so in school. She is currently working full-time, filling in as a sales

clerk while regular staff are on vacation. She has only been working at this job for one month.

This dropout reports the highest frequency of criminal involvement among females in the sample, thirty-one offences in the prior year. While this respondent did not report being questioned by the police as a suspect, she did report being convicted of one criminal offence in the previous year. In terms of involvement in specific offences we find the respondent admitting: shoplifting twenty times; selling illegal drugs five times; getting into a fight for fun five times; and theft under fifty dollars once.

This respondent currently lives at home and pays a minimal monthly rent. There is, thus, some degree of support from family. Nonetheless, there is little evidence of major attachment or interaction between the respondent and her mother. In addition, the respondent shows little interest in her current job, as well as past jobs. She also shows little development of future occupational goals. And there is little evidence of significant involvement in conventional non-labour market activity. Let us cut into the interview when she is asked about furthering her education:

I: Would you go back to school?
R: No, I was thinking about next year, but if I still got this job I'm not going to waste their time or mine.

This comment might lead one to suspect that the respondent has some commitment to this job or that it is a necessary part of some career plan, but this is not the case. We find the respondent stating of her present and past employment:

I: What do you like about the job you have right now?
R: It's boring.
I: What kind of job did you have before this?
R: I worked at A & W. I started there in October cause I really don't like working in the summer time, you know, like you have more things to do...

I: A & W how long [did you work]?
R: October to January. I go through jobs like they don't agree with me it has to be a fun place to work.

Later in the interview the respondent is asked about her future in general and her major goals in life:

I: How do you feel about the direction your life is going right now?
R: It's okay I guess, I only live day by day, you never know what will happen the next

day. You can get run over or anything. It doesn't matter to me.

I: What are your major goals in life, what do you want out of it? Do you want to just work in a store or do you?
R: I want to work in a swimming pool that's what I want. I want to be a life guard. I have to get my act together.

The respondent states that she does have her life saving swimming certificate. However, it would seem that this career goal was prompted by the interviewer's somewhat leading question about the respondent wanting to work in a store all her life. For just after this the respondent replies in response to the following questions:

I: In five or ten years what kind of job do you think you will have?
R: Never thought about.

In terms of attachment to or interaction with her family, the respondent is asked:

I: How often do you get together with your family?
R: Not much, only on special occasions.

I: If you have a big problem when things aren't working out for you, who do you talk to?
R: My best friend, she lives in Evansburg, so I just keep it inside me.
I: How do you get to talk to her then?
R: She comes to town, me and her will talk and talk, tell her my problems and that's about it.

From these comments and the lack of any other mention of mother-daughter interaction or affection, it would seem that there is not enough mother-daughter attachment here to constitute any major social control in this respondent's life. The minimal involvement in conventional activity on the part of this respondent is well emphasized when this respondent states:

I: How do you spend your time when you aren't working?
R: Come here [West Edmonton Mall] meet friends and go to parties and play table top soccer. That's my hobby, no it's not.
I: Who do you spend your time with?
R: Everybody — all my friends, whoever I run into.

I: How often do you see your friends?
R: Mostly everyday. I hop, skip and jump with everybody.

At the end of the interview, when asked about criminal involvement this respondent somewhat contritely discusses an occasion when she was apprehended for one of her numerous theft offences and, inadvertantly, notes a proclivity to violence:

I: Have you had any troubles with the law?
R: Sure.

I: What sorts of things?
R: Oh it was called theft.
I: Shoplifting?
R: Something I would never do again, a $100 fine.
I: Okay, how did you get involved were you with friends?
R: I was with one of my friends and she got caught too.
I: So you both had to pay $100.
R: Yes - a $9.00 little jobbie, and a $100 fine that was crazy too.
I: That's the only problem you ever had.
R: ...I used to work at Fantasy Land eh and I worked there a week and this girl wanted this mug and it was $5.00 she had only $3.00 so I said I'll give it to you for $2.00 and then the supervisor came and canned me and tried to get me thrown out of the mall for three months. I tried to beat the ____ out of him.

The final transcript in this section is from respondent #162. As can be seen from Table 64, this is one of the high crime respondents who does have a large number of major social controls (4 out of 5). This respondent left school in grade twelve because she was bored with school. This was only a couple of months ago. She was working part-time prior to leaving school; they offered full-time employment and she left school to take it. The respondent reports having a lot of personal problems in the previous year. Her grandfather had passed away in this period, which was hard on her. In addition, she has moved out of her parents' home in order to get away from her father.

In the questionnaire, we find this respondent admitting to: shoplifting once; selling illegal drugs four times; getting into a fight just for fun three times; and damaging or destroying property twice. We have here a total of ten reported offences. However, the respondent does not report being questioned by the police as a suspect about some crime, or being convicted for a criminal offence in the previous year. Moreover, she states that she has never been apprehended or convicted for any of her criminal behavior. It is thus perhaps not surprising that this respondent has no discussion of involvement with the law, during the interview.

Let us briefly examine the existence of the major social controls in this respondent's life, as well as the absence of future occupational goals. In terms of the respondent's current job, we find her giving a somewhat contradictory response to the question — was leaving school a good or bad thing?:

R: Right now, I think it is great. I hate working full-time it's so different because when you are in school you can say hey I don't want to go and I'm going to sleep in, it's no

problem because you can catch up the next day.
I: Do you wish you were back in school?
R: Sometimes yeah but then I think about how much I hated it.

While working full-time, there would appear to be little commitment to the job on the part of this respondent; indeed it is only the lesser of two evils. She has had several other jobs in the past, from which she was laid off. Money appears to be the main motivator in this repondent's work life. This ambivalence about her current job may be all the greater given that the respondent had once had higher expectations for herself:

R: Actually, I never really expected, all through high school I expected to go to university and walk out with this law degree and things like that eh. So I never really anticipated a wage.

A further analysis of the interview transcript reveals high monetary aspirations but little development of future occupational goals. The respondent states the one main advantage of a better paying job to be:

R: I think my life style would go much higher, like more things, but I'm not only a material person but I would like money. I like to travel. I would like to be independently wealthy and just travel.

Yet this respondent has not developed any career plan to satisfy this desire for wealth and independence:

I: Okay, lets talk about your major goals?
R: I was just talking about this with a friend of mine the other day. I don't know and I think that is probably my biggest problem right now, because I don't know what I want to do with my life.
I: Okay, say in 5 or 10 years is there a job you would like to be in?
R: Definitely, I don't want to work at Shoppers Drug Mart. This promotion [to cosmetologist] is really great and I would like to work at it for a year, I don't want it as a career unless it is a real good paying job. I kind of have a high standard eh and I want to live it, you know.

I: So do you think your goals have changed?
R: They have gotten more confused, I don't know what I want anymore.

Some degree of social control would appear to exist in this respondent's life due to mother-daughter attachment and general family socio-economic supports. This is evident when the respondent is asked:

I: How [do] you get along with your family and friends? How often do you get together with your parents?
R: I talk to my mom every night, when I first moved she called me every night just to make sure I was okay and that I had enough money for this and that. I see them once a week.

I: How do you think your family helped you out?
R: Very much emotional and moral as well... .they really help me.

In terms of conventional activity this respondent states:

I: How do you spend your time when you're not working?
R: I jog, joined the spa, ride the bike, like walking in Laurier [Park], horseback riding.

These are quite obviously very conventional and upper middle class leisure activities. The sum total of the mother-daughter attachment, family support and conventional activity-based social controls would not appear, however, to be great enough to deter this respondent from multiple involvements in crime.

In summary, we found that non-criminal dropouts generally were missing very few of these major social controls. Collectively, non-criminal males were missing only five out of fifty and non-criminal females only nine out of fifty of these critical social controls. Highly criminal dropouts, particularly males, were much less likely to report their presence. Highly criminal males were missing forty, and highly criminal females thirty-three, out of fifty social controls.

On an individual level, no non-criminal male was missing more than two of these five major social controls, whereas no highly criminal male had more than two of these controls present in their life. Similarly, no non-criminal female dropout was missing more than two out of five of these social controls. Individual high crime females, however, were more likely than their male counterparts to have major social controls present in their out-of-school life. Given that the overall rate of criminal involvement by high crime females was low relative to that for high crime males, we might expect criminal female dropouts to still report a moderate presence of social controls. Nevertheless, we did not expect to observe the presence of as many major social control elements among individual high crime female dropouts.

Two points stood out when we examined the interview transcripts of female dropouts. First, for non-criminal females, the one main exception to the general presence of these social controls was the lack of development of major occupational goals. This stood out all the more sharply given the high presence of occupational goals among non-criminal males (nine out of ten respondents with occupational goals). It would thus appear that the development of

occupational goals is not as crucial a dimension in the social control dynamics for female dropouts. Second, highly criminal females were lower than non-criminal female dropouts on all listed social controls. The most notable difference between the two groups, however, centered on the existence of substantial mother-daughter attachment. While only two out of ten non-criminal females did not have notable mother-daughter attachment, only two out of ten high crime females did show major mother-daughter attachment.

VIII. Conclusion

In this concluding chapter we first review the results of the previous data analyses. Based upon these results, we provide answers to the three specific research questions guiding this thesis. We also return to the question of whether social control theory can be extended to take account of out-of-school experiences, particularly labour market experiences, in the lives of dropouts. Finally, we offer some suggestions for future research on important dimensions of the out-of-school social control process.

Let us first, however, offer a few summary observations on the study. We worked with secondary data that was gathered in a semi-structured interview. This presented certain problems, a central one was missing data, which we managed to cope with in our data analyses. In addition, we had a non-random sample of dropouts. It is thus difficult to generalize from our results to dropouts generally, and to young people overall.

Nonetheless, we feel that the present research provides valuable information on the relationship between the level of labour market success and criminal, alcohol and drug involvement. For unlike much earlier research in this area, we have multiple measures of labour success, and of other general social controls. We also focus upon relatively serious street-crime. Our blending of quantitative and qualitative data is, moreover, fairly unique. These two forms of data analysis complement each other quite well, and provide a much stronger analysis than either presented individually. Finally, a recent Canadian study on schooling shows that one in three youths, in certain major urban areas, drops out of school (cf. Tanner and Krahn, 1988). Given this latter fact, it hould be obvious that the focus upon dropouts is currently a major social and sociological concern.

A. Summary of Results

In chapter four, cross-tabular analyses were presented to answer the first basic question in this study: to what extent is there a relationship between labour market-based social controls and out-of-school involvement in crime, alcohol and drugs. Chapter four also questioned whether the relationship between social control and deviance varied for different

labour market measures as well as for different types of crime, alcohol and drug use.

The results for the crime indices showed that unemployed respondents were much more likely than either the full or part-time employed to be involved in some crime. Nonetheless, a full fifty percent of all full and part-time employed dropouts were involved in some crime. An analysis of the property crime index revealed the expected relationship with current labour market status. As labour market involvement decreased, involvement in property crime went up. The violent crime index showed no relationship with current labour market status. There was also little indication that heavy alcohol or drug use were associated with current labour market status.

Next we examined the total months of unemployment experienced by dropouts. For the total crime index we found a moderate positive relationship, but perhaps surprisingly, no relationship whatsoever between total months unemployed and the property crime index. The small number of cases make it difficult to say much about the relationship between this labour market measure and the violent crime index. However, as total months of unemployment went past six months, there was noticeably greater involvement in violent crime. Finally, alcohol use showed a moderately strong positive relationship, and drug use a fairly strong positive relationship, with total months unemployed.

We next examined length of jobs held, a measure of job stability. We found no relationship between any of the three crime indices and length of jobs held. Contrary to what we would expect, heavy alcohol use was somewhat more prevalent among dropouts with greater job stability. No relationship was found, on the other hand, for drug use.

Finally, we tested the number of jobs held as a measure of labour market success. For the total crime index we found only a small positive relationship and for the property crime index a moderate positive relationship with number of jobs held. The violent crime index showed no relationship with this labour market variable. For both alcohol and drug use we found a moderately strong relationship with the number of jobs held: alcohol and drug use were more frequent among those with fewer jobs.

In summary, in these quantitative analyses we found eight (out of twenty) substantial zero-order relationships between labour market integration measures and involvement in crime, and alcohol and drug use. Each of these eight relationships was as predicted by our out-of-school extension of social control theory. Low labour market-based commitment was associated with high crime and heavy alcohol/drug use. Only one relatively weak relationship, between length of jobs held and alcohol use, was found which went contrary to what we expected in our extension of social control theory. We thus conclude that in certain instances labour market integration measures are related to involvement in crime and drug and alcohol use. However, as only eight out of twenty analyses showed a substantial relationship, we must conclude that, while they are important, labour market social controls are not the only major social controls in the lives of dropouts.

In chapter five the analyses focused on variation by sex and age in the relationship between labour market social controls and the crime indices, as well as alcohol and drug use. In addressing the second research question about sex and age effects on the labour market-crime relationship, we observed only three 2-way interaction effects. Thus, generally sex and age did not condition the relationship between labour market social controls and involvement with crime, alcohol and drugs. In the two instances where we did find sex to be important it was males who exhibited higher property and violent crime when experiencing poor labour market integration. In the third 2-way interaction, we found that age affected the relationship between total months unemployed and drug use. For younger dropouts more months of unemployment were associated with increased drug use. For older respondents, drug use was highest among those who had been unemployed an intermediate length of time.

Research question three was addressed in chapter six where we looked at whether there were any additional effects of other social controls on crime and drug use. The non-labour market social controls of concern here were general commitment, involvement in conventional activities, and attachment, particularly to parents.

There were ten substantial 2-way interaction effects. Higher levels of illegal drug use appeared to be related to a combination of poor labour market integration (as measured by

three different variables) and low aspirations. On the other hand, higher rates of criminal involvement — total, property and to a lesser extent violent — were more likely to be related to low labour market integration combined: (i) with respondents having a low economic status (i.e. usually short of money); or (ii) being involved in relatively unconventional activity, such as drinking[82] and hanging out in malls, either alone or with friends.

All of the main effects were in the predicted direction. Similarly, the majority (seven out of ten) of the substantial 2-way interactions were also in the direction predicted by our out-of-school extension of social control theory. Dropouts with low labour market and low non-labour market social controls, in the majority of cases, had the highest rate of crime and illegal drug use. Thus, there is evidence here that non-labour market social controls also play a substantial part in the genesis of crime and deviant behaviour among high school dropouts.

In chapter seven, a qualitative analysis of the dynamics of the out-of-school social control of crime was presented. Five major social controls were identified by a careful reading of interview transcripts: (i) currently employed/at school full-time; (ii) the development of occupational goals; (iii) father-son attachment for males and mother-daughter attachment for females; (iv) involvement in conventional activity and, (v) the presence of economic support and social relations with others, usually family but often friends.

The primary goal of the qualitative analysis was to see whether there might be a cumulative absence of social controls, both labour market and other, in the lives of male and female dropouts. This is important, since Wiatrowski et al. (1981:526) criticise social control theory, as formulated by Hirschi (1969), for failing to consider how his four dimensions of control might act simultaneously to affect the likelihood of delinquent behavior. Krohn and Massey (1980:542) have also stated that future research on social control theory should investigate the interaction between these elements, and must also take into account the salience which each element has for different individuals.

---

[82]Fairly regular alcohol consumption, which occurs in the absence of notable general involvement in conventional activity such as work/education, is deemed relatively unconventional behavior.

Consistent with these critiques of social control theory, three specific questions guided the qualitative analysis. First, to what degree were these social controls present in the lives of non-criminal as opposed to highly criminal dropouts? Two, were any particular social controls, or combination thereof, likely to be present in the lives of non-criminal dropouts and absent for highly criminal dropouts? Three, to what extent were there gender differences in these social control dynamics?

We found that non-criminal dropouts generally were missing very few of these major social controls. Collectively, non-criminal males were missing only five out of fifty and non-criminal females only nine out of fifty of these critical social controls. Highly criminal dropouts, particularly males, were much less likely to report their presence. Highly criminal males were missing forty, and highly criminal females thirty-three, out of fifty social controls.

On an individual level, no non-criminal male was missing more than two of these five major social controls, whereas no highly criminal male had more than two of these controls present in their life. Similarly, no non-criminal female dropout was missing more than two out of five of these social controls. Individual high crime females, however, were more likely than their male counterparts to have major social controls present in their out-of-school life. Given that the overall rate of criminal involvement by high crime females was low relative to that for high crime males, we might expect criminal female dropouts to still report a moderate presence of social controls. Nevertheless, we did not expect to observe the presence of as many major social control elements among individual high crime female dropouts.

Thus, for male dropouts, social controls seemed to exist in an all or none fashion. Non-criminal male dropouts were missing very few social controls, while highly criminal male dropouts had very few of these social controls in their life. This suggests the question of whether any one social control is particularly important in the establishment of other social controls in the lives of male dropouts. We turn to this question when we discuss future research suggestions later in this chapter.

When we examined the interview transcripts of female dropouts two points stood out. First, for non-criminal females, the one main exception to the general presence of these social controls was the lack of development of major occupational goals. This stood out all the more sharply given the high presence of occupational goals among non-criminal males (nine out of ten respondents with occupational goals). It would thus appear that the development of occupational goals is not as crucial a dimension in the social control dynamics for female dropouts. Second, highly criminal females were lower than non-criminal female dropouts on all listed social controls. The most notable difference between the two groups, however, centered on the existence of substantial mother-daughter attachment. While only two out of ten non-criminal females did not have notable mother-daughter attachment, only two out of ten high crime females did show major mother-daughter attachment.

B. Extending Social Control Theory: Implications of the Data

In this section we consider the contribution that our findings make to social control analyses of crime and deviance. While centered on our three specific research questions, this evaluation also includes some more general observations on extending social control theory.

Research Question One

We began by asking whether there was a relationship between labour market-based social controls and out-of-school involvement in crime/deviance? Based upon the quantitative results, we must answer "yes". In certain instances, we found substantial relationships between labour market measures and deviant behavior. However, given that only eight out of twenty zero-order analyses showed a substantial relationship, we must conclude that, while they are important, labour market social controls are not the only major social controls in the lives of dropouts.

These results should come as no surprise. In chapter one we discussed Grainger's (1981) critique of the search for univariate relationships between labour market factors, notably unemployment, and crime. We also discussed Greenberg's (1979) and West's (1984)

analyses of the anti-criminogenic role that families play for labour market-disadvantaged youth. Given the difficulty that much previous research has had in teasing out the relationship between labour market success and crime [13], our finding of eight zero-order relationships between labour market-based measures of commitment and deviance should be considered significant.

In the qualitative analysis we found that two dimensions of labour market experience were important in the out-of-school social control process for males, namely, being currently employed /at school full-time, and the development of future occupational goals. For females, only the former was important. We shall have more to say about these gender differences in social controls when we consider research question two. We return to the interplay between labour market and non-labour market social controls when we once again address the third research question.

Part two of the first research question was, to what extent does the labour market-deviance relationship vary across different measures of labour market success as well as of deviance? As was seen in the data analyses, the relationship between labour market success and deviance certainly did vary depending on the measure of labour market success and deviant behavior utilized. However, there was not really a systematic pattern of relationships between specific measures of labour market based success and types of deviance. The most notable finding was that involvement in violent crime was not related to any measure of labour market integration.

These data are interesting and important in their own right, although these specific relationships are not all that unexpected (cf. Thornberry and Christenson, 1984:400; and Hirschi 1969:188). What is more important are the increased theoretical scope and analytical capacity, as well as added policy implications, provided by an extended social control theory which links out-of-school social controls with the involvement of older adolescents and young adults in relatively serious crime.

---

[13]Also see Witte (1979) and Horwitz (1984); for an analysis of the difficulty of assessing the relationship between labour market success and criminal involvement. On the other hand, for some very promising recent research on this issue see Farrington et al. (1986).

The primary concern in our analysis of labour market-based commitment is with the structural-historical nature, and implications, of labour market opportunities for youth. Individual effort, family contacts and general socio-economic status, not to mention gender, may determine who moves up the ladder of occupational success and how high up they go. However, the number of labour market opportunities, the degree and type of social and economic rewards, and opportunities for mobility are not individually determined. The main point here is that it is the structure of the labour market which basically determines the number and type of employment opportunities. Hence, labour market-based commitment may also be a function of structural-historical circumstances. This conclusion has motivated a large amount of debate on structural sources and solutions to a range of social concerns. The most notable work, of course, is that done by Marx and subsequent radical and liberal scholars (cf. Taylor, Walton and Young, 1973 and Currie, 1985, respectively).

In the past decade such structuralist analyses came to be focussed on young people in general, and on young school leavers in particular. The first wave of social and academic concern with youth appeared in the late 1950's and 1960's as the baby boomers reached adolescence. The current concern with youth is grounded in the structural realities of the fiscal crisis affecting western capitalist economies, and in the debate over how socio-economically marginalized youth will respond to this reality (cf. O'Connor, 1984; Rees and Atkinson, 1982; and Tanner et al., 1985). Wallace (1987:1) notes that this concern with labour market problems is a primary motivating factor in much of the current scholarly, and popular, concern with youth in Britain:

> During the 1970s, mass unemployment became recognized as an enduring structural feature of the labour market. This had particularly serious repercussions for young people's jobs, so that leaving school no longer leads automatically to starting work. For many people, their social status, their role in the community, and their role within the family have had to be reconstructed and this has important implications for young people who are encountering these problems for the first time in the post-war period.

Hills and Reubens (1984:310) state in their recent international survey of labour market opportunities for youth that the ratio of youth to adult wages has deteriorated significantly in the past ten years. In addition, they note that some recent empirical research

has found "consistent patterns of assignment and retention in the 'bad' jobs through much of youths working life". Essentially this means that many youth are caught in a cycle of shifting from one marginal job to another, often inter-mixed with periods of unemployment, as they seek more meaningful employment. [14] Kraus (1979:21) has also noted that "The world's economic situation of recent years has made it increasingly difficult... for young people to secure a job essential to their gaining the social foothold for adulthood".

Youth unemployment rates rose dramatically until about 1985 and then dropped off to a still relatively high rate. More importantly the growth of a service-based economy is also a pervasive feature of western industrial society (Krahn and Lowe, 1988). One primary concern here is that the jobs open to young people, particularly those with little education, generally offer few economic rewards and career opportunities (also cf. Kraus, 1979). Given these analyses of the structure of youth labour market opportunities, Hirschi's (1969:21) central assumption that most people have a sufficient stake-in-conformity to generate commitment-based social control is somewhat questionable.

For out-of-school youth, and adults, occupational careers are supposed to provide the route to this largely material commitment to conventional society (i.e. goods, reputations and prospects). Unfortunately, Hirschi (1969) does not discuss why only most and not <u>all</u> people have occupational careers and the stake-in-conformity attendant thereon. However, in fairness to Hirschi (1969), a human capital model of labour market success [15] and more labour market opportunities were the order of the day when he formulated his social control theory.

In our opinion, current labour market realities no longer support, if they ever did, Hirschi's (1969) assumption of the almost universal availability of labour market based commitment. It is thus essential to conceptualize theoretically, and empirically analyze the role that variation in out-of-school labour market integration plays in the social control of crime

---

[14]For example see the transcript excerpts for respondent #082, one of the non-criminal females in chapter seven.

[15]See Krahn and Lowe (1988) for an elaboration of human capital theory and problems with it. See also their discussion of labour market segmentation theory, which is generally replacing a human capital theory of labour market attainment.

and deviance. Our empirical findings on the labour market-deviance relationship do, however, support Hirschi (1969) when he stated that labour market-based commitment was an important social control, in this case in the lives of dropouts.

The previous discussion of the necessity of extending social control theory to take into account historical-structural variation in labour market-based commitment is quite consistent with some recent general critiques of social control theory by Box (1981) and West (1984), as well as earlier critiques by Elliot et.al. (1979) and Greenberg (1977). As Box (1981:150) noted, social control theory may be criticised when it simply posits a relationship between individualistic social-psychological factors (e.g. attachment, commitment, involvement and belief) and involvement in crime, but does not analyse sources of variation in the social controls. For by doing this, social control theory may be concentrating on an intervening level between independent (structural and historical) variables and the dependent variable crime. Box (1981) argues that research, such as that by Willis (1977) and Corrigan (1979), which integrates ethnographic research on the experiences of individuals into a broader macro-structural and historical context, provides a more complete explanation of the cause of crime. To quote Box (1981:150)

> Thus rather than being satisfied that social bonding may be related to delinquency we might begin to wonder what causes differential bonding in the first place. For example, if we consider [in-school] commitment, then it is quite clear from a number of works (Elliot and Voss, 1974; Frease, 1973; Hargreaves, 1967; Kelly and Pink, 1973; Polk and Pink, 1971; Thomas, Kreps and Cages, 1977) that this is linked to the social structure of schools.

We will conclude this discussion of the necessity of looking at structural sources of variation in social controls with one last point. Most of this structural critique of social control theory comes from writers such as Greenberg (1977), Box (1981), West (1984) and Colvin and Pauly (1983). While they might attempt to integrate social control variables into their analyses, as did Elliot et.al. (1979), they were not social control theorists per se. Does this mean that social control theorists, and the theory, are unable to take into account structural sources of variation in social controls? Our answer is no. While not denying the validity of such an integrated theoretical approach, we point out that early social control research by Toby (1957) argued for a macro-based social control analysis. Hagan (1986:167)

reviews this earlier work and cites Toby (1957) as holding that:

> One measure of a "just" society is that it provides meaningful places for its members. For those who find a meaningful place in society, and for those who believe in the promise of such a place, there is a "stake in conformity"... This problem begins in the family, gains significance in the school and ends in the workplace.

We shall continue our discussion of structural sources of variation in social controls when we consider the policy implications provided by our extension of social control theory.

Research Question Two

The second research question in this thesis was, to what extent are there significant age and gender differences in the out-of-school labour market integration and crime, as well as alcohol/drug use, relationship?

In brief, the quantitative analyses suggest that neither sex nor age have much effect in this relationship. However, due to problems of small cell sizes we could not look at the combined effects of sex and age, or at either of these variables combined with non-labour market social controls such as attachment. This may be important since sex and age may interact to affect the labour market-deviance relationship. For example, perhaps labour market integration is primarily related to crime/deviance when respondents are both older and male. But let us consider the data, and their implication for social control theory, first for age and then for sex.

The primary thrust in the present research was to go beyond Hirschi's (1969) in-school-based formulation of social control theory. We wanted to test an extended social control theory which considered out-of-school social controls, particularly labour market integration, in the lives of older adolescents and young adults. Much of this concern was generated by the research of Agnew (1985), La Grange and White (1985) and Johnson (1979) as well as the review, and critique, of social control theory by Vold and Bernard (1986). Each of these scholars essentially concluded that social control theory was unimportant in predicting delinquency among middle to older adolescents and adults. This was held to be particularly the case when one focused upon relatively serious predatory crime.

These writers may have been correct when they levelled this critique against Hirschi's (1969) in-school test of social control theory. However, our research indicates that the criminal and deviant behavior of older adolescents and young adults, in this case dropouts, is related to low social controls. The criminal behavior focussed upon here is, moreover, fairly serious.

One finding merits special comment here. A primary objective in our test of social control theory with an older sample was to move beyond a future aspiration-based model of social controls. More specifically, we wanted to evaluate the relationship between the degree of labour market success which dropouts had actually managed to achieve, and their involvement in crime, alcohol, and drugs. Yet our data indicate that Paternoster et. al. (1983:461) were apparently correct when they stated that treating commitment as, at least in part, future oriented is particularly important for a post-high school youth population which is still in the process of establishing many of the material commitments which could be jeopardized by criminal deviance. In the quantitative analysis, two future-oriented social controls were found to be important: did respondents plan on getting more education?; and had they selected a future occupation? In the qualitative analysis, the development of attainable future occupational goals also turned out to be a major social control, at least for males.

Hirschi (1969:21) would thus also appear to be correct about out-of-school social control processes when he stated that "one is committed to conformity not only by what one has but also by what one hopes to attain".

The difference between our findings, and those of Agnew (1985) and LaGrange and White (1985) on the applicability of social control theory to older adolescents and young adults should not be surprising. Agnew (1985:59) concludes his critique of social control theory by stating that future research should attempt to determine those variables that are important in predicting delinquency among older adolescents, and then cites Greenberg (1977) who provides a list of such variables. One of the most central concerns in Greenberg's (1977) analysis of "Delinquency and The Age Structure of Society" is the integration/exclusion of

adolescents from the world of work. Our findings are thus not totally unexpected and do constitute an important out-of-school labour market-based extension of social control theory.

Let us now turn to the issue of gender. The qualitative data indicate that currently being employed/at school full-time is an important out-of-school social control that differentiates non-criminal from highly criminal dropouts, both male and female. On the other hand, developing occupational goals appears to be more important in the social control process for males than for females. The quantitative data also indicate little gender-based variation in the labour market and crime, alcohol, and drug use relationship. The exceptions are two relationships between unemployment-based measures of labour market success and crime found only for males. These findings suggest that the (un)employment dimension of labour market experience may be a much more salient social control in the lives of males.

These findings support Gomme (1986) when he stated that the social control element of commitment (in this case labour market based commitment) is generally more important for male involvement in crime than for females. The data in this thesis, however, do not imply that all dimensions of labour market based commitment, such as job stability, are unimportant in the social control of female crime/deviance. This may be particularly true when we look at non-violent deviance.

Is, then, labour market-based commitment a less relevant social control in the lives of females? Or do females have certain non-deviant social and behavioural options open to them, that men generally do not, when faced with labour market integration problems. With our data it is difficult to resolve this concern. However, research by Wallace (1987) supports the latter conclusion. In her recent study of youth (un)employment in Britain, Wallace (1987:71) noted that there are gender-specific responses to the problem of poor labour market prospects for young school leavers. She suggested that one option, still generally open to young women, is to focus one's sights on a traditional in-the-home future. Wallace (1987:75) also stated that one specific dimension of this maternal role modeling was the development of mother-daughter identification and interaction. As found in our qualitative analysis, mother-daughter attachment was the greatest single differentiator between

non-criminal and highly criminal female dropouts. It would, thus, appear that these young females integrate components of traditional female roles with their labour market aspirations. Employment problems could conceivably lead to an emphasis upon a traditional in-the-home career in the long run. Short run labour market success (currently having a job and quality of employment) would still appear to be a notable concern for these young females.

This focus upon male-female differences must not, however, blind us to certain important similarities in the social control process for both males and females. In his article on the "Unexplained Crimes of Class and Gender", Hagan (1986) outlines the origin of much of the concern with different types and degrees of social controls for males and females. Interestingly, from our perspective, these developments in social control analyses have been tied to historical changes in industrialization and the labour market.[34] Hagan et.al. (1979:26) had considered the same issue:

> The sexual stratification of crime and work was linked historically to the removal of men's work from the home and the emergence of formal segregative agencies of social control. With the rise of commercial trade and commerce, and later industrialization, there emerged a growing differentiation between formal and informal structures of social control.... Thus, in the formative years of the sociology of deviance, researchers were concerned most conspicuously with informal processes of social control. These early explanations of deviance gave considerable attention to the role of the *family* and *community* in accounting for increasing rates of crime and delinquency in changing urban environments.
>
> Gradually, interest shifted to socially structured patterns of opportunity and to the growing impact of *formal* agencies of social control (e.g. the police, courts and corrections) on individuals and finally to such agencies as institutions worthy of study in and of themselves. The question asked most commonly today is how such agencies come, historically and organizationally, to seek out as their customary targets young, poor, urban, males, and how this selection corresponds to the wishes of dominant interest groups.

Hagan's (1986) main contribution was to argue that this shift in focus from informal social controls, such as the family, to formal social controls and deterrence factors, such as courts, has resulted in a state of affairs such that daughters more than sons are the objects of informal familial controls. An examination of the Hagan et.al. (1979:31) research shows that these authors had only two measures of informal familial social controls, which they acknowledged as coming from Hirschi (1969): does your father/mother know where you are

[34]See Scull (1976) for an in depth analysis of the historical shift toward formal social control processes.

when you are away from home?; and does your father/mother know who you are with when you are away from home? Based upon these measures Hagan et.al. (1979) concluded that females, more than males, were the object (and instrument) of informal social controls.

However, it could be argued that these two measures are basically proxy indicators for parental attachment. As Hirschi (1969:88) noted in his discussion of parental attachment, "which children are most likely to ask themselves, 'What will my parents think?'". His answer was, those children who think their parents know where they are and what they are doing.

It is our position that in our analyses, both qualitative and quantitative, we have a better test of the importance of parental attachment for the social control of criminal involvement. Moreover, in opposition to Hagan et.al. (1979) and Hagan (1986), the data in our qualitative analyses distinctly indicate that parental attachment, specifically father-son attachment, is a major factor differentiating non-criminal from highly criminal male dropouts. It, moreover, appears to be at least as important as familial attachment (mother-daughter) for females. In addition to this, labour market-based commitment can be conceptualized as an informal external social control, and it is certainly an important social control in the lives of dropouts, especially males. In short, the data in this thesis do not indicate that female dropouts are more often the object of informal social controls. Given that dropout rates in certain major areas of Canada are hitting thirty-three percent, this is an important sub-set of youth.

One final note on the applicability of informal social controls for both males and females is necessary. Our main concern has been with extending social control theory to take account of labour market integration-based social control. We have focussed upon this failure, and the necessity to do so, in Hirschi's (1969) formulation of social control theory. Essentially the same criticism can be levelled against Hagan (1986) and the debate over formal and informal social controls.

Hagan et.al. (1979) and Hagan (1986) do not consider the informal social control function, as outlined in this thesis, that labour market integration plays as men, more so than women, move into the world of work. Hagan (1986:75) noted that formal social controls do

extend beyond the law, and informal social controls do extend beyond the family. However, the only mention of labour market based social controls was: (i) to the formal controls provided by semi-legal rules and work personnel, such as security people and (ii) to the informal social controls provided by work groups. No mention is made of the social control role that labour market integration itself plays. As we have discussed in this thesis, labour market based-commitment is a major social control for out-of-school youth.

It is thus our position that the debate on the historical shift and current applicability of informal versus formal social controls has been erroneously circumscribed. The options are not just fading informal social controls, especially for males, versus formal justice system-based social controls and deterrence. For not only has the applicability of informal familial social controls, such as parental attachment, for males been underestimated, but informal labour market-based social control processes have essentially been ignored. Policies for reducing crime which center on non-formal deterrence, especially for males, are similarly then not appropriately considered. On this latter issue we shall have more to say in the following section.

Research Question Three

Research question three concerned the extent to which non-labour market out-of-school social controls in the lives of dropouts were related, either by themselves or in conjunction with poor labour market integration, to involvement in crime, alcohol and drug use. An analysis of the 2-way interaction effects between labour market and non-labour market social controls on crime and illegal drug use revealed that these interactions were relatively important in the out-of-school social control of deviance.

The most salient point in these particular quantitative findings, however, is that certain combinations of low labour market and non-labour market social controls are apparently related to certain types of deviant behavior. This finding is important, for as Krohn and Massey (1980:536) and Wiatrowski et.al. (1981) note, one of the main problems with social control theory, as formulated by Hirschi (1969), is that it only predicts that some

deviant behavior will occur given a breakdown in social controls. In its current formulation, social control theory does not make any statement concerning what type of crime will be the response to low social controls.

Our research constitutes one step towards extending, or refining, social control theory by indicating what type of deviant behavior may be associated with certain patterns of breakdown in social controls. More specifically, our data indicate that when out-of-school youths have low labour market based-commitment, and see few educational/occupational chances for the future, they retreat into relatively high illegal drug use. This is a likely response to the problem of loss of social controls, when it is perceived in the individual psyche as a form of individual and social meaninglessness. Low labour market integration combined with low general commitment and being involved in relatively unconventional behavior, alone or with friends, was related to relatively high rates of criminal involvement (total, property and to a lesser extent violent crime). These particular respondents would appear to be responding in a relatively simple utilitarian fashion. They have little to lose and something to gain from crime. Deviance which occurs in the absence of social controls can be both psychologically[17] and materially rewarding. In the logic of control theory, this is one major reason why social controls are necessary in the first place.

Social controls, and their absence, must do something to and/or for the individual at a social-psychological level. Hirschi's (1969) social control theory is well known, and criticised as we have seen, as an individual social-psychological theory of criminogenesis. However, virtually no attempt has been made at the individual level to ascertain just how and why social controls operate, especially as a complex social-psychological network to control behavior. Hirschi's (1969) formulation of social control theory thus not only ignores sources of variation in social controls themselves, such as structural factors, but also essentially leaves out the individual. Box (1981) thus appears to be quite correct when he stated that future research on social control theory must combine structural and ethnographic research. We must evaluate sources of variation in Hirschi's (1969) social controls as well as why their presence

[17]This may be the relatively innocuous fun outlined by delinquency theorists from Thrasher (1937) onward. It may also be much more pathological violent offences.

may prevent crime at the individual level.

Turning to the qualitative data, our reading of the transcripts and subsequent data analysis revealed that the social control process for dropouts contained an important dynamic blending of labour market and non-labour market-based social controls. This data also provides empirical support for the contention, noted in chapter one, that research into the labour market-crime relationship must look at other major factors in the lives of youth, in this case dropouts, in order to fully explicate the causes of delinquency/crime (cf. Grainger, 1981; Greenberg, 1979 and West, 1984). Our data also indicate that Wiatrowski et.al. (1981) and Krohn and Massey (1980) were correct when they stated that social control theory, and empirical analyses based upon it, must consider how the elements of the social bond might act simultaneously to affect the likelihood of delinquent behavior.

In this qualitative analysis we provided some information, in the respondents' own words, on how certain social controls did, or did not, function in their lives. However, consistent with our critique of the lack of in-depth analyses on how social controls operate at the individual level; research in this area must be further expanded if we are to really understand the causes of crime.

C. Extending Social Control Theory: Policy Implications of the Data

Our extension of social control theory obviously does not unravel all of the complexities of the out-of-school social control of crime and deviance process, either for dropouts or young adults in general. Nonetheless, we have elaborated upon certain specific contributions of our research to social control theory in our summary of data analyses and answers to the three research questions. An additional benefit may be the policy implications of our findings. Thus we conclude with some comments on social policies designed to reduce crime and forms of deviance such as excessive alcohol and drug use.

Agnew (1985:47) pointed out that social control theory has quickly become one of the dominant theories of delinquency and that "the policy implications of the theory are beginning to receive serious attention (see Empey, 1982; Shoemaker, 1984; Weis, 1977)".

However, in many respects it has been the paucity of policy implications which has been the concern in social control theory analyses.

Both West (1984) and Linden (1987) provide general critiques of social control theory. One relatively new, and apparently growing, criticism of the theory is emerging on top of these general critiques. Both of these authors state that social control theory can be cited for having few implications for social policy. As Linden (1987:234) notes, critics question the relevance of a theory of the causes of delinquency which has few recommendations for doing something about it.

Linden's (1987) analysis of potential anti-criminogenic policy initiatives based upon social control theory is consistent with the general in-school, early adolescence focus of the theory. The only crime control solutions discussed focus upon the family and the school.[11] Linden (1987) does not explicitly comment on the limited relevance of these policy initiatives for dealing with relatively serious crime among older adolescents and young adults. These are individuals who are unlikely to still be in school and who, in many cases, have few family resources to build upon. Of course, as we have noted, out-of-school individuals and social control processes have not been a major concern for social control theorists. Linden (1987:239) does, nonetheless, conclude that:

> Now that the relationship between social bonding variables and delinquency has been well-established, future research from the social control perspective will likely follow three directions. First, more work will be done which integrates social control variables with those of other theories. Second, structural aspects of social control theory will be explored....Finally, more policy-related work will be done based on the social control perspective. Our knowledge of the factors that lead to deviance may enable us to reduce it.

Two important policy related findings emerge from this thesis. The first combines the second and third observations just made by Linden (1987). Labour market opportunities for youth are structural in nature and subject to historical variation, such as during an economic recession and/or significant shifts in the nature of labour market opportunties (cf. Hills and Reubens, 1984; Kraus, 1979; Krahn and Lowe, 1988). Labour market-based commitment, a major social control, can thus likewise be said to be in large part structurally determined. This

[11] See also Hirschi's (1983) crime control discussion in "Crime and the Family", in J.Q. Wilson (ed.), Crime and Public Policy.

fact logically implies that one major venue for decreasing crime, as well as alcohol and drug abuse, is to increase the labour market opportunities open to many people, particularly youth, who are currently only marginally integrated into conventional society.

It is essential to state that creating more low paying "jobs, jobs, jobs", to quote a well known political leader and slogan, will likely do nothing to significantly increase the number of "occupational careers" spoken of by Hirschi (1969). We have shown in our qualitative vignettes that many youths switch in and out of marginal-work-world-jobs frequently (see also Hackim, 1982). These jobs provide very little occupational success and virtually no opportunity for upward mobility. Moreover, the quantitative analysis in chapter four showed that a full fifty percent of dropouts currently employed were still involved in crime. As we have shown in the descriptive statistics, the majority of these dropouts were working in "marginal work world jobs" which provided very little stake-in-conformity.

Two important questions arise here. First, why don't we provide meaningful employment for millions of currently marginalized individuals in "conventional" western industrial society. Second, will, and/or should, marginalized workers, particularly young people relatively new to the labour market, unproblematically accept relatively low labour market integration. To answer the first question, as numerous social critics from Marx to present day Canadian Jesuit priests (cf. Czerny and Swift, 1984) have pointed out, the basic economic structure and organization of "conventional" western society is capitalist. Workers and employment opportunities are governed, with certain restrictions, by the profit motive. One of the best ways to generate profit is to cut labour costs, especially through mechanization. As Krahn and Lowe (1988) and others document, unemployment and underemployment, in short the marginalization of much of the labour force, has been the historic reality of our economic system (cf. also Warrian, 1987). This is the basic structure and organization of our conventional society, and our ostensibly egalitarian political system has done little to change it. Our society is currently organized for profit, not for jobs and occupational careers for all (cf. Czerney and Swift, 1984).

Turning to question two, as Greenberg (1979:589) has argued, and Wallace (1987) shown, young people do not easily and simply accept the lack of "conventionally defined 'success' and the realization that opportunities for upward mobility are drastically limited". Moreover, the fact that youth may reorient their aspirations over time in the face of structurally restricted labour market opportunities is no reason to disregard the structural nature of labour market opportunities per se. As Wallace (1987:223) stated in her analysis of youth (un)employment in Britain, the best conceptual framework for understanding the causes and consequences of youth labour market integration problems, is to set the problem of the transition from school to work, or no work, within a broader analysis of social and cultural reproduction in fiscal crisis plagued western economies. Seen against this larger background, according to Wallace (1987:223), the main sociological problem in youth labour market integration analyses becomes "how they ever accepted the jobs open to them rather than why they rejected them."

Our answers to these questions indicate that the economic and political realities are such that labour market policies for reducing crime and deviance have not been followed in the the past and are not likely to be implemented in any significant way in the near future. On the other hand, marginalized youth are not likely to simply accept their poor labour market prospects without some resistance and accomodation over time. Indeed as Wallace (1987) argued, and we would concur, there is no necessity for them to do so. Where does this leave criminology, particularly in terms of policies for reducing crime? As we shall discuss in the following section, social control policies have increasingly centered on deterring through the use of courts and jails individuals who, in large part, are marginalized under the existing relations of production. [19] Such policies focus upon the crime problem that individuals create for society and essentially ignore, and thus perpetuate, the labour market problem that society creates for many individuals.

---

[19]Grainger (1981) noted that one enduring fact in the controversy over the relationship between employment and crime, is that over 40% of incarcerated individuals were unemployed at time of arrest. In general, over 80% of all inmates have poor employment histories (cf. Waller, 1974).

The second important policy-related finding centers on the fact that informal social controls are a significant factor in the out-of-school social control process for both males and females. This was true when we considered labour market based-commitment, an informal-external social control, as well as parental attachment, an informal-internal social control.

This finding has important implications for halting what Meier (1982), Scull (1976), Currie (1985) and Lynes (1985) see as a general conservative trend towards coercive crime control programs and policies based upon formal deterrence types of social control. Theories and research on crime and delinquency (e.g. Hagan et.al., 1979 and Hagan, 1986), while not explicitly advocating coercive deterrence policies, do feed into this approach by focussing upon the formal nature of social controls for males. Informal social controls such as parental attachment and labour market based commitment are essentially ignored. [90]

As Lynes (1985) noted:

> Translating criminological research into public policy has been dominated in recent years by the conservative wing of the discipline. The twin pillars of this movement—deterrence and incapacitation—have been embraced by conservative politicians, as evidenced by initiatives bringing back the death penalty, increasing the severity of legal sanctions, and increasing the number of persons in prison. The strength of this conservative movement is made all the greater by the lack of a coherent response from the more moderate and liberal wing of the discipline. Disillusionment over the "failure of rehabilitation," coupled with the widespread rejection of the Great Society legislation, has paralyzed any sort of integrated response to the conservative, punitive strategies based on incarceration or death.

Research is emerging, however, which offers a critique of, and alternatives to, conservative formal deterrence-based crime control policies. [91] One notable piece of research in this vein was that by Paternoster et.al. (1985). Based upon their comparison of formal deterrence and informal social controls these authors argued that the inhibition of criminal involvement may best be explained by extra-legal influences: moral beliefs; informal sanctions, such as loss of attachments; and some kinds of conventional commitments. These

---

[90]Hagan (1985:166) noted the general shift in focus from informal to formal social control analyses and stated that; "Of course none of this meant that the family was now of no importance [explicitly], but Wilkinson (1974, 735) suggests that we began to think and act more and more as if this were the case".

[91]For a recent review of this issue see Kennedy (1988), "Legal Responses to Crime and Conflict".

findings, they noted, suggested the need for a careful reconsideration of the role of the threat of formal legal sanctions in theories of social control and indicated that the debate on the deterrence doctrine has not yet been conclusively resolved. Williams and Hawkins (1986) have, moreover, argued in a recent provocative review of the formal versus informal deterrence debate that formal social controls, such as imprisonment, may only be a deterrent to crime if the individual has something to loose from the application of the official deterrent, such as attachment to others and/or commitment costs, including cost of arrest for future goals.

One of the most recent and best attempts to counteract this conservative program/policy trend, however, has been made by Currie (1985). As Lynes (1985) notes in his review of Currie's (1985) work, Currie convincingly refutes the central tenants of conservative criminal control ideology and policy. For example, he demonstrates fairly conclusively that a high crime rate in the U.S.A. cannot be attributed to an overly lenient judicial system, a frequent conservative assumption. Currie (1985) then constructs a well thought out Liberal-Left platform and set of policy recommendations for preventing crime (Lynes, 1985).

What is most important for our research is that Currie's (1985) crime control policy recommendations single out middle range programs to improve family dynamics, such as parent-child attachment, as well as long-range policies which focus upon improving structural labour market opportunties (cf. Toby, 1957). Here we may quote Lynes (1985) summary of Currie's (1985) work:

> [Currie] recommends the establishment of "family support programs" where families could receive training, guidance and support toward improving child-rearing practices. Other possible innovations include early education of disadvantaged children, expanded dispute resolution programs and family-support programs which will ease the economic pressures during the early years of child-rearing.

Our research indicates that parent-child attachment and socio-economic supports may also be needed in the later years of child-rearing. One major reason for this is that youth have experienced an increasing period of dependence upon parents over past decades, particularly during the latest economic recession and this may strain parent-child economic

and social relations. (cf. Greenberg, 1977; and Wallace, 1987, respectively). The primary cause of this increased period of parental dependency has been the increased labour market entrance requirements as well as limited employment opportunities for young people.

Currie's (1985) next, and most far-reaching, set of recommendations are quite consistent with our empirical findings on the labour market integration-deviance relationship. They also complement our general discussion of the structurally constricted nature of labour market opportunities open to substantial numbers of young people, especially dropouts. As Lynes (1985) noted, a central theme in all of Currie's (1985) crime control policies is the need for a more equitable economic structure. Let us quote Currie (1985:263-5) on this crucial concern:

> In the long run, a commitment to full and decent employment remains the keystone of any successful anticrime policy.... On the desirability of full employment in the abstract, there is likely to be little disagreement. But an effective anticrime policy requires a sharper and more focused conception of what we mean by full employment. It is not enough to call for "more jobs", what are required are good jobs. Nothing will be gained by attempting to force the poor and the young into employment that cannot provide either an adequate living or a sense of dignity and self-respect. The point should be obvious. But in fact much recent employment policy is based on precisely the opposite principle.

Importantly, Lynes (1985) recognized that any academic discussion of change in income distribution is politically problematic, adding that there is little evidence to indicate that nations such as the United States will trade a reduced crime rate for major changes in political economy. The same probably applies to Canada.

It is our opinion, however, that criminological theory and research cannot be constructed around what may or may not be politically expedient, especially to an advantaged elite, at any one point in time. Based upon the findings and discussion in this thesis there is no logical, as opposed to political, reason why social control theory and policies cannot be expanded to focus upon out-of-school social control processes, especially including the contribution that labour market-based commitment can make to reducing crime. Our data also point out that more immediate middle-range crime control policies which focus upon improving parent-child attachment may also be important. For Hirschi's (1969) statement on the value of attachment, while originally directed to in-school adolescents, would also appear

to hold true for older adolescents and young adults. [92]

A necessary final point remains to be made. Linden (1987) pointed out that one future development in social control theory would likely be its integration with other theoretical perspectives. We agree with this conclusion. However, in this thesis our objective was not to produce an integrated theory such as that of Elliot et.al. (1979). Our task was to extend social control theory itself, such that it could take into account structural as well as familial and individual factors in the causation of crime, more particularly, relatively serious crime among out-of-school dropouts. Essentially the only integration we attempted was the addition of a structural variable, namely labour market opportunities for youth, to a relatively straight-forward social control analysis.

However, integrating social control theory with a general structuralist labour market-based analysis of crime is particularly important given recent developments in youth culture research, largely based in Britain. As Wallace (1987) noted in her study of youth (un)employment in Britain, most previous cultural reproduction studies, such as that by Willis (1977) and Corrigan (1979), were concerned with "how working class kids get working class jobs". Cultural and structural continuity, generally construed as working class integration into capitalism, was the issue and the problem for the Left. In social control terminology, this was the generation-to-generation reproduction of "conventional society".

However, Wallace (1987) also noted generally rising unemployment rates in recent decades in Western nations, major changes in the nature of labour market opportunities, particularly for young people, and the dim prospects for better labour market prospects for many people in the future. She stated that the major theoretical and empirical concern in current youth culture research is one of "fracture", not continuity, in the genesis of "conventional society", to use Hirschi's term. Here the concern is with what happens when "working class kids do <u>not</u> get working class jobs". [93] In her research she looks at adaptation

[92]Again, we must be attuned here to the issue of a growing period of youth dependence upon parents in recent decades (cf. Greenberg, 1977), particularly during the recent economic recession. This may be particularly true for our relatively severely labour market disadvantaged dropouts.

[93]Some notable concern on this issue has been generated by Derber (1978) in his

and resistance by youth, and their families, to this "fracture". The relationship between poor labour market integration and crime/deviance is not, however, one of her main concerns.

Our attempt to extend social control theory by incorporating labour market experiences is important, for we provide fairly detailed quantitative and qualitative data on this latter issue. This research thus indicates the usefulness of combining two significant, but as of yet incomplete, approaches to the study of crime and deviance, namely social control theory and cultural reproduction research.

In summary, we have provided answers to the three research questions and outlined some important contributions that our study makes to extending social control theory as well as critiquing formal deterrence theory. We also considered the policy implications of our out-of-school extension of social control theory. Here we emphasized the importance of non-coercive informal social controls, particulary long term structural change leading to greater labour market opportunities, especially for young people. In the final section of this chapter, and thesis, we offer some general and specific recommendations for future research.

D. Future Research

Our main recommendation for future research is that we should continue to extend and refine the analysis of out-of-school social control processes in the lives of both dropouts and young adults in general. Successful labour market integration-based social controls would appear to be a substantial component in this general process, meriting particular attention. However, even within the area of labour market-based analyses of crime, several specific issues need attention.

Recent research by Colvin and Pauly (1984) attempted to combine structuralist analyses with Marxist and mainstream criminological research to analyze the interplay between

---

[93](cont'd) discussion of 'universal job entitlement' among young people and their response to poor employment prospects. Similarly, Cohen (1973) has generated interest in sources of 'moral panics', such as high youth unemployment, and responses to this perceived threat. However, little empirical research has been conducted within the area of youth culture research on the labour market integration-deviance relationship. However, see Farrington et.al. (1986).

structural factors under capitalism, school, work and the family in the production of delinquency. Following the lead set by these writers, future research should consider the impact that parental labour market experiences have upon parent-child relations, and the genesis within the family of social controls. Parent-child attachment should be a central concern in such research. Research has also shown that delinquents are less attached to parents as well as teachers (cf. Leblanc, 1981). However, as West (1984:149) notes, "rather than actively rebelling against conventional authorities, these youth seem to find them simply less powerful role models, less attractive to emulate". A crucial research issue from our perspective would be the role that the parents' labour market success, as well as that of the family in general, plays in making the parent an acceptable role model for the child.

We have commented on the pivotal role that parental attachment appears to play in the process of social control for male dropouts. While we cannot single out any one of the major elements of the social bond as the most important in the lives of dropouts, from reading the transcripts it would appear that parental attachment, particularly father-son attachment for males, is quite crucial in the social control of crime. This assertion is based upon the salience, in a multiplicity of ways, of this element in dropouts lives. In large part this salience comes out as a "gut reaction" that something is going on that is notable, but hard to specify.

However, involvement in conventional activity (dimensions include being employed/at school full-time, the development of occupational goals, and the presence of family-based socio-economic supports/relations), would in large measure appear to be interconnected with the presence of this major social control. More specifically, dropouts without significant father-son attachment seem to find it much more difficult to develop and sustain occupational goals. As Hirschi (1969:91) found in his study of in-school delinquent versus non-delinquent adolescents:

> Only 5 percent of the boys who often discuss their future plans and often share their thoughts and feelings with their fathers have committed two or more delinquent acts in the year prior...while 43 percent of those never communicating with their fathers about these matters have committed as many delinquent acts.

Hirschi (1969) does not elaborate upon the dynamics of this dimension of social control. However, in the lives of dropouts, and youth generally, two basic dimensions to this process likely exist. First, when the father is absent or unwilling to provide for the respondent economically, the individual may enter the marginal work world early in life. Jobs in this labour market provide little room for mobility and insufficient remuneration to allow much, if any, savings for future development. Second, dropouts without notable father attachment conceivably lack a male model to encourage striving, planning and delayed gratification in order to achieve some degree of socio-economic success. The passing of substantive knowledge, and access to contacts, from father to son would also be important. Even given the increasing labour force participation of women, it is generally the adult male who would be the most knowledgable figure-head in this career development process (cf. Willis, 1977:75).

One dimension of this paucity of goal development would appear to be taking jobs which essentially have no future or room for career development. These respondents are then frequently laid off from seasonal labour, realize the lack of a future, and quit or get fired from lack of interest in the job. Not having a full-time job or being enrolled in school would appear to be one aspect of this dual problem of lack of father-son attachment and absence of occupational goals.

In Western industrial societies generally, but particularly in a recession strained economy, there are a limited number of "quality jobs" for young people in general, but especially for dropouts (cf. Wallace 1987; and Hills and Reubens, 1984). Thus it is dropouts with this extra edge who have the guidance to develop major occupational goals and the moral/economic support to weather out the frequently frustrating period of integration into "quality jobs" with some meaningful future and attendant social control.

In conclusion, future research on out-of-school youth, dropouts and others, should analyze not only macro labour market factors but also individual micro social control dynamics in order to maximally explicate out-of-school involvement in crime and with relatively serious deviance. The blending of quantitative and qualitative data as done in the

present research, as well as in research by Wallace (1987), would appear to be a fruitful methodological approach.

References

Agnew, R.
1985 "Social Control Theory and Delinquency: A Longitudinal Test." Criminology 23(1):43-61.

Atkinson, P. and T. Rees
1982 "Youth Unemployment and State Intervention." in T. Rees and P. Atkinson (eds.) Youth Unemployment and State Intervention. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Babbie, E.
1986 The Practice of Social Research. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Bailey, K.D.
1982 Methods of Social Research. New York: The Free Press.

Bartel, A.
1979 "Women in Crime: An Economic Analysis." Research Paper No. 143, New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Business.

Beasley, R. and G. Atunes
1974 "The Etiology of Urban Crime: An Ecological Analysis." Criminology 11(4):439-461.

Bonger, W.
1916 Criminality and Economic Conditions. Boston: Little, Brown.

Box, S.
1983 Power, Crime and Mystification. London: Tavistock Publications.

1981 Deviance, Reality and Society. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Braithwaite, J.
1979 "Unemployment and Adult Crime: An Interpretation of the International Evidence." in Proceedings of the Institute of Criminology, No. 36. Unemployment and Crime, Sydney: The University of Sydney.

Brenner, M.H.
1976 "Effects of the Economy on Criminal Behavior and the Administration of Criminal Justice in the United States, Canada, England and Wales, and Scotland." Economic Crises and Crime. Publication No. 15, Rome: United Nations Social Defence Research Institute.

Canada
1985 Canadian Crime Statistics. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

1984 Youth: A New Statistical Perspective on Youth in Canada. Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada.

Center for Econometric Studies of the Justice System
1979 "A Review of Some of the Results in Estimating the Social Cost of National Economic Policy: Implications for Mental and Physical Health, and Criminal Aggression." Hoover Institute.

Clarke, A.
1985 "The Effects of Unemployment on Political Attitude." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 21:100-108.

Clarke, A. and M. Clissold
1982 "Correlates of Adaptation among Unemployed and Employed Young Men." Psychological Reports 50:887-893.

Cloward, R. and L. Ohlin
1960 Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press.

Coffield, F., C. Borril and S. Marshall
1983 "How Young People Try to Survive Being Unemployed." New Society 64:332-334.

Cohen, A.
1955 Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, S.
1973 Folk Devils and Moral Panics. London: Paladin.

Colvin, M. and J. Pauly
1983 "A Critique of Criminology: Toward an Integrated Structural-Marxist Theory of Delinquency Production." American Journal of Sociology 89:513-551.

Corrigan, P.
1979 Schooling the Smash Street Kids. London: Mcmillan.

Current Population Reports
1978 Series P. 23, No. 66, Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce.

1975 Series P. 23, No. 55, Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Currie, E.
1985 Confronting Crime: An American Challenge. New York: Partheon Books.

Czerny, S. and J. Swift
1984 Getting Started on Social Analysis in Canada. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Danziger, S.
1976 "Explaining urban crime rates." Criminology 14:291-95.

DeFronzo, J.
1983 "Economic assistance to impoverished Americans: Relationship to incidence of crime." Criminology 21:119-36.

Derber, C.
1978 "Unemployment and the Entitled Worker: Job-Entitlement and Radical Political Attitudes Among the Youth Unemployed." Social Problems 26:26-37.

Dorn, N. and N. South
1983 Of Males and Markets: A Critical Review of Youth Culture Theory. Research Paper #1. London: Middlesex Polytechnic, Centre for Occupational and Community Research.

Downes, D. and P. Rock
1982 Understanding Deviance. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edmonton Public Schools Board
1983 "Monitoring of Student Withdrawals: 1982-83." Edmonton: Edmonton Public Schools Board.

Elliot, D.S.
1966 "Delinquency, School Attendance and Drop-out." Social Problems 13(3):307-314.

Elliot, D., S. Ageton and R. Canter
1979 "An Integrated Theoretical Perspective on Delinquent Behavior." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 16(1):3-27.

Elliot, D.S. and H. Voss
1974 Delinquency and Drop-out. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Ehrlich, I.
1973 "Participation in Illegitimate Activities: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation." Journal of Political Economy 81:521-565.

Erickson, R.
1975 Young Offenders and their Social Work. Westmead: Saxon House.

Farrington, D., B. Gallagher, L. Morley, R. St. Ledger, and D. West
1986 "Unemployment, School Leaving, and Crime." British Journal of Criminology 26(4):335-356.

Feyerherm, W.
1976 "The Employment History of Prison Releasees." in L.R. Euler and W.A. Franks, Jr. (eds.) Report: The Governor's Conference on Employment and the Prevention of Crime. Madison: State Manpower Council.

Fleisher, B.M.
1966 The Economics of Delinquency. Chicago: Quadrangle.

1963 "The Effect of Unemployment on Juvenile Delinquency." Journal of Political Economy 71(6):543-555.

Forst, B.
1976 "Participation in Illegitimate Activities: Further Empirical Findings." Policy Analysis 2:477-492.

Fox, J.A.
1978 Forecasting Crime Data. Lexington: D.C. Heath.

Freeman, R.
1983 "Crime and Unemployment." in J. Wilson (ed.) Crime and Public Policy. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.

Gibbons, D.
1987 Society, Crime, and Criminal Behavior. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Gillespie, R.
1975 Economic Factors in Crime and Delinquency: A Critical Review of the Empirical Evidence. Final report submitted to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Glaser, B. and A. Strauss
1967 The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, D. and K. Rice
1959 "Crime, Age and Unemployment." American Sociological Review 24(5):679-686.

Gomme, I.
1986 "Predictors Of Status And Criminal Offences Among Male and Female Adolescents In An Ontario Community." in R. Silverman and J. Teevan (eds.) Crime in Canadian Society. (3rd edition) Toronto: Butterworths.

Gore, S.
1978 "The Effect of Social Support In Moderating The Health Consequences Of Unemployment." Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 19:157-165.

Grainger, R.
1981 Unemployment and Crime: A Critique of Methodology. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.

Greenberg, D.
1985 "Age, Crime, and Social Explanation." American Journal of Sociology. 91(1):1-21.

1979 "Delinquency and the Age Structure of Society." Criminology Review Yearbook: 586-620.

Greenwood, M. and W. Wadycki
1973 "Crime Rates and Public Expenditures for Police Protection: Their Interaction." Rev. Soc. Econ. 31:138-151.

Grieson, R.
1972 The Determinants of Juvenile Arrests. Working Paper No. 87, Department of Economics, Boston: M.I.T.

Gupta, K.L.
1969 Aggregation in Economics. Rotterdam: Rotterdam University Press.

Hackim, C.
1982 "The Social Consequences of High Unemployment." Journal of Social Policy 11:433-467.

Hagan, J.
1986 "Toward A Structural Theory Of Crime, Race And Gender." in R. Silverman and J. Teevan (eds.) Crime in Canadian Society. (3rd edition) Toronto: Butterworths.

1985 Modern Criminology. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

1977 The Disreputable Pleasures. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Hagan, J., A.R. Gillis and J. Simpson
1985 "The Class Structure of Gender and Delinquency: Toward a Power-Control Theory of Common Delinquent Behavior." American Journal of Sociology 90(6):1151-1178.

Hagan, J., J. Simpson and R. Gillis
1979 "The Sexual Stratification of Social Control: A Gender-Based Perspective on Crime and Delinquency." British Journal of Sociology 30:25-38.

Hannah, M.T.
1971 Aggregation and Disaggregation in Sociology. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Hardin, E.
1975 "Human Capital and the Labor Market Success of New Parolees." Proceedings of the American Statistical Association: 330-335.

Harp, J. and J. Hofley
1980 Structured Inequality in Canada. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall.

Hartnagel, T. and J. Tanner
1982 "Class, Schooling and Delinquency: A Further Examination." Canadian Journal of Criminology 24:155-172.

Henley, D. and L. McPheters
1974 "Crime as an externality of regional economic growth." Review of Regional Studies 4:73-84.

Hills, S. and B. Reubens
1984 "Youth Employment in the United States:" in B. Reubens (ed.), Youth at Work: An International Survey. Totowa: Rowman and Allanheld.

Hindelang, M., T. Hirschi and J. Weiss
1981 Measuring Delinquency. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hirschi, T.
1983 "Crime and the Family." in J.Q. Wilson (ed.) Crime and Public Policy. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.

1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T. and M. Gottfredson
1983 "Age and the Explanation of Crime." American Journal of Sociology 89(3):552-584.

Horwitz, A.
1984 "The Economy And Social Pathology." Annual Review of Sociology 10:95-119.

Humphries, D. and D. Wallace
1980 "Capitalist accumulation and urban crime, 1960-1971." Social Problems 28:179-93.

Institute for Social Research (I.S.R.)
1978 Youth in Transition. V6. Adolescent to Adulthood - Change and Stability in the Lives of Young Men. Ann Arbour: The University of Michigan.

1971 Youth in Transition. V.3. Dropping Out - Problem or Symptom? Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Jahoda, M.
1981 "Work, Employment, and Unemployment." American Psychologist 36(2):184-191.

Jeffrey, C. and I. Jeffrey
1970 "Delinquents and Dropouts: An Experimental Program in Behavior Change." Canadian Journal of Corrections 12:47-58.

Johnson, R.
1979 Juvenile Delinquency and its Origin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kalbach, W. and W. McVey
1979 The Demographic Bases of Canadian Society. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Kennedy, L.
1988

Kohen, A.
1979 Determinants of Labour Market Success Among Young Men: Race, Ability, Quantity and Quality of Schooling. Columbus: Ohio State University, Centre for Human Resource Research.

Kornhauser, R.
1978 Social Sources of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Krahn, H. and G. Lowe
1988 Work, Industry and Canadian Society. Scarborough: Nelson.

Krahn, H., G. Lowe and J. Tanner
1984 "The Social-Psychological Impact of Unemployment in Edmonton." Edmonton Area Series Report No. 31, Edmonton: Population Research Laboratory, University of Alberta.

Kraus, J.
1979 "Juvenile Unemployment and Delinquency," in Proceedings of the Institute of Criminology, No. 36. Unemployment and Crime, Sydney: The University of Sydney.

Krohn, M. and J. Massey
1980 "Social Control and Delinquent Behavior." The Sociological Quarterly 21(4):529-543.

Labour Canada
1983 Part-time Work in Canada. Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Part-time Work. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

LaGrange, R. and H. White
1985 "Age Differences in Delinquency: A Test of Theory." Criminology 23(1):19-45.

1983 "An Integrated Explanation of Age Differentials in Juvenile Delinquency." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

Land, K. and M. Felson
1976 "A General Framework for Building Dynamic Macro Social Indicator Models: Including an Analysis of Changes in Crime Rates and Police Expenditures." American Journal of Sociology 82:565-604.

LeBlanc, M.
1981 "An Integrative Control Theory of Delinquent Behavior." Paper presented to American Society of Criminology, Washington.

LeBlanc, M., L. Biron and L. Pronovost
1979 Psycho-social development and delinquency evolution. Mimeograph. Montreal: University of Montreal.

Linden, R.
1987 "Social Control Theory." in R. Linden (ed.) Criminology: A Canadian Perspective. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lowe, G. and H. Krahn
1984 Working Canadians. Agincourt: Methuen Publications.

Lynes, M.
1985 "Confronting Crime: An American Challenge by Elliot Currie." Criminology 23:771-775.

Matras, J.
1984 Social Inequality, Stratification, and Mobility. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Maynard, R.
1979 The Supported Work Demonstration: Effects During the First 18 Months After Enrollment. Princeton: Mathematical Policy Research Inc.

McCarthy, B. and J. Hagan
1987 "Gender, Delinquency, and the Great Depression: A test of power-control theory." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 24(2):153-177.

McGee, R.
1980 Sociology. An Introduction. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McPheters, L.R. and W. Stronge
1974 "Law Enforcement Expenditures and Urban Crime." National Tax Journal 27:633-644.

Meier, R.
1982 "Perspectives on the Conception of Social Control." Annual Review of Sociology 8:35-55.

Morris, D. and L. Tweeten
1971 "The Costs of Controlling Crime: A Study in Economics of City Life." Annals of Regional Science 5:35-50.

Mukherjee, S.K.
1971 A typological study of school status and delinquency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

O'Connor, J.
1984 Accumulation Crisis. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Orsagh, T.
1981 "A Criminometric Model of the Criminal Justice System." in J. Fox (ed.) Models in Quantitative Criminology. New York: Academic Press.

Orsagh, T. and A. Witte
1981 "Economic Status and Crime: Implications for Offender Rehabilitation." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 72(3):1055-1071.

Osterman, P.
1980 Getting Started. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Paternoster, R., L. Saltzman, G. Waldo and T. Chiricos
1983 "Perceived Risk and Social Control: Do Sanctions Really Deter?" Law and Society Review 17:457-479.

Petersilia, J.
1980 "Criminal Career Research: A Review of Recent Evidence." Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research 2:321-379.

Phillips, J. and D. Kelly
1979 "School Failure and Delinquency: Which Causes Which?" Criminology 117:194-207.

Phillips, L., H. Votey and D. Maxwell
1972 "Crime, Youth and the Labour Market." Journal of Political Economy 80:491-504.

Pirog-Goode, M.
1981 Relationships Between Youth Crime and Employment: A Theoretical and Empirical Approach. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, No. 8117835, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Polk, K., C. Adler, G. Bazemore, G. Blake, S. Cordray, G. Coventry, J. Galvin and M. Temple
1981 Becoming Adult: An Analysis of Maturational Development from Age 16 to 30 of a Cohort of Young Men. Final Report of the Marion County Youth Study. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Radzinowicz, L.
1968 "Economic Conditions and Crime." Paper presented to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, quoted in C. Chester, "Perceived Relative Deprivation as a Cause of Property Crime." Crime and Delinquency, 1976, 22:17-30.

Ross, M.
1973 Economic Conditions and Crime: Metropolitan Toronto 1965-1972. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.

Rossi, P., R. Berk and K. Lenihan
1980 Money, Work and Crime: Experimental Evidence. New York: Academic Press.

Scull, A.
1976 "Madness and Segregative Controls: The Rise of the Insane Asylum." Social Problems 24:337-351.

Shaw, C. and H. McKay
1942 Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shover, N., S. Nordland, J. James and W. Thornton
1979 "Gender Roles and Delinquency." Social Forces 58:162-175.

Siegel, L. and J. Senna
1981 Juvenile Delinquency - Theory, Practice, and Law. New York: West Publishing.

Singel, L.D.
1967 "An Examination of the Empirical Relationship Between Unemployment and Juvenile Delinquency." Journal of Economics and Sociology 26:377-386.

Sjoquist, D.L.
1973 "Property Crime and Economic Behavior: Some Empirical Results." American Economic Review 63:439-446.

Smith, D.
1979 "Sex and Deviance: An Assessment of Major Sociological Variables." Sociological Quarterly 21:183-196.

Swimmer, E.
1974 "Measurement of the Effectiveness of Urban Law Enforcement - A Simultaneous Approach." Southern Economic Journal 40(4):618-630.

Tanner, J. and H. Krahn
1988 Reflections on Radwanski. Unpublished working paper.

Tanner, J., G. Lowe and H. Krahn
1985 "Youth Unemployment and Moral Panics." in T. Fleming (ed.) The New Criminologies in Canada. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, D.
1983 "Analyzing Qualitative Data." in P. Rossi, J. Wright and A. Anderson (eds.) Handbook of Survey Research. New York: Academic Press.

Taylor, I.
1984 Theorizing the Crisis in Canada: Legitimation Crisis, Hegemonic Crises or Otherwise? Departmental Working Paper 84-1, Ottawa: Carleton University.

Taylor, I., P. Walton and J. Young
1973 The New Criminology: For a Social Theory of Deviance. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Thomas, C. and J. Hyman
1978 "Compliance Theory, Control Theory and Juvenile Delinquency." in M. Krohn and R. Akers (eds.), Crime, Law, and Sanctions. London: Sage.

Thornberry, T. and R. Christenson
1984 "Unemployment and Criminal Involvement: An Investigation of Reciprocal Causal Structures." American Sociological Review 49:398-411.

Thornberry, T., M. Moore and R. Christenson
1985 "The Effect of Dropping Out of High School On Subsequent Criminal Behavior." Criminology 23:3-18.

Toby, J.
1957 "The Differential Impact of Family Disorganization." American Sociological Review 22:505-512.

Tunley, R.
1962 Kids, Crime and Chaos. New York: Dell Publishing.

Vandaele, W.
1978 "An Economic Model of Auto Theft in the United States." in J. Heinke (ed.) Economic Models of Criminal Behavior. New York: North-Holland.

Vold, G.B. and T. Bernard
1986 Theoretical Criminology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wadycki, W. and S. Balkin
1979 "Participation in Illegitimate Activities: Forst's Model Revisited." Journal of Behavioral Economics 8:151-163.

Wallace, C.
1987 For Richer, For Poorer: Growing up in and out of work. New York: Tavistock.

Waller, I.
1974 Men Released From Prison. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Warrian, P.
1987 "Trade Unions and the New International Division of Labour." in R. Argue, C. Gannagé and D. Livingstone. (eds.) Working People. Toronto: Garamond.

Watson, K.
1983 "Introduction - Youth, Education and Employment: The Challenge of the 80's." in K. Watson (ed.), Youth, Education and Employment -International Perspectives. London: Croom Helm.

Weicher, J.
1970 "The Effect of Income on Delinquency: Comment." American Economic Review 60(1):249-256.

West, G.
1984 Young Offenders and the State. Toronto: Butterworths.

1980 "The Short-Term Careers of Serious Thieves." in R. Silverman and J. Teevan, Jr. (eds.) Crime in Canadian Society. (3rd edition) Toronto: Butterworths.

Wiatrowski, M., D. Griswold and M. Roberts
1981 "Social Control Theory and Delinquency." American Sociological Review 46:525-541.

Wilkinson, K.
1974 "The Broken Family and Juvenile Delinquency: Scientific Explanation or Ideology." Social Problems 21:726-739.

Williams, K. and R. Hawkins
1986 "Perceptual Research on General Deterrence: A Critical Review." Law and Society Review 20:545-572.

Willis, P.
1977 Learning to Labour. Westmead: Saxon House.

Wilson, J. and R. Herrnstein
1985 Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Witte, A.
1980 Quarterly Journal of Economics 94:57-84.

1979 Unemployment and Crime: Insights from Research on Individuals. Statement Prepared for the Hearing of the Joint Economic Committee on the Social Costs of Unemployment. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1976 "Earnings and Jobs of Ex-Offenders: A Case Study." Monthly Labor Review 97:31-39.

Appendix I

Edmonton Youth Employment and Unemployment Study: Interview Schedule

1. REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/RELEVANCE OF SCHOOL WORK

WHY DID YOU LEAVE SCHOOL?

How long ago (when)?

WHAT courses did you take? How were you doing?

How did you decide to quit school?

Any of your friends quit?

Were you skipping?

Do you think graduating would have helped you to get a job?

Would you go back to school?

So, was leaving a good/bad thing?

2. JOB SEARCH STRATEGY/WORK HISTORY

DO YOU HAVE A JOB?

IF NO	IF YES
How long have you been unemployed?	What do you do at your job?
Have you been unemployed in the past? (When and for how long?)	What do you like/dislike about your job? (Your work?)
Have you had any job(s) since you quit high school? (What were they? How long did they last?	How did you look for this job?
Are you looking for a job?	Did you have any problems looking for work?
How do/have you look(ed)?	Have you had other job(s)? What kind(s)? How long did they last?
How many jobs do/have you apply(ed) for in a week? What kinds?	Have you ever been unemployed? For how long?
Any problems in looking for work?	Have you been given any good advice about looking for work?
Have you been given any good advice about looking for work?	What advice would you give to someone looking for a job?
What would you tell someone looking for a job?	Why do you think you have a job

Why do you think some kids have jobs while others don't?	while some other kids don't?
Do you think school has helped you to look for work?	Do you think school helped you look for a job?

3. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS/FINANCES

WHO ARE YOU LIVING WITH?

Are you supporting anyone (boy/girlfriend, child(ren)?)

What do you live on?

Are you getting by? Are you getting any help; NOW or in the PAST? (Welfare, UIC, family, other items.)

Have you had to cut back on anything? Has this caused any problems?

How would your life change if you had a job/better paying job?

4. STRUCTURE OF THE DAY

HOW DO YOU SPEND YOUR TIME WHEN YOU'RE NOT LOOKING/WORKING?

Who do you spend your time with?

What do you do and where do you go? HOW MUCH can you afford to spend per week?

How have you activities changed since you:

became unemployed?
found a job?

Do you belong to any groups/clubs? (sports, hobbies)

What about any volunteer or community work?

Why? (Reasons for leisure activities)

5. SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND COPING

CAN YOU TELL ME HOW YOU GET ALONG WITH YOUR FAMILY/FRIENDS?

FAMILY	FRIENDS (boy/girlfriends)
How often do you get together?	How often do you get together?
What kinds of things do you do?	What kinds of things do you do?
How do they help you out?	How do they help you out?

When things aren't working out/when you have a real problem is there someone you can turn to? Who?

Have any of these relationships changed since you:

became unemployed?
found a job?

How'd your family react to your quitting school?

How far did your parents go in school?

What is your mother's/father's job? What do they do at work?

Has anyone in your family ever been unemployed? Who? When? Why? (Explain the circumstances)

Have any of your friends ever been unemployed?

6. EFFECTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON WELL-BEING

HOW'VE YOU FELT LATELY...PHYSICALLY, MENTALLY...?

(A) How do you feel about yourself?

How do you feel about your life in general?

WE'D LIKE TO KNOW HOW MUCH UNEMPLOYMENT HAS AFFECTED YOU(R) HEALTH/FEELINGS

	IF UNEMPLOYED	IF EMPLOYED
(B)	Now that you're unemployed, how do you feel?	How did you feel when you were unemployed?
	Have these feelings changed over time	How have your feelings changed since you've been employed?

7. PERCEIVED CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

WHY DO YOU THINK THERE'S SO MUCH UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE?

Whose responsibility is it?

Is there anything young people can do about it?

Have you ever tried to do anything about unemployment? What?

Among young people, who has the best chance of getting a job?

Do you think everybody has a right to a job? Why?

8. GOALS

WHAT ARE YOUR MAJOR GOALS IN LIFE?

What do you see yourself doing in 5 or 10 years?

What kind of job would you like?

Would you get more education? What kind(s) and how would you go about it?

Think you might want to get married/have a family someday?

Do you think that your goals have changed since you've become unemployed?

Overall, what would you like to do with your life?

IS THERE ANYTHING I MAY HAVE MISSED? WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADD ANYTHING?

9. OPTIONAL: WOULD YOU LIKE TO TALK ABOUT ANY TROUBLE YOU MIGHT HAVE GOTTEN INTO WITH THE LAW?

What sort of things were you doing?

How did you get involved in these things?

How has this changed since you've become unemployed?

Appendix II

Edmonton Youth Employment and Unemployment Study: Instructions to Respondents

EDMONTON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STUDY

We would like you to participate in an interview which will become part of our study of youth employment and unemployment in Edmonton. We are a team of researchers at the University of Alberta, and we are interested in your experiences in school, and after leaving school, particularly your experiences in looking for work. Along with questions about this, we would also like to talk about things like your favourite pastimes, your friends and family, your goals in life and so on.

The interviewer who has contacted you is part of our research team, and she or he will be talking to several dozen other young people besides you. The interviewer will also give you a short set of questions on paper which should be easy to answer. Some of these questions are about your school experiences, others are about your personal feelings and opinions, and others are about things which might have got you into trouble with the law. We would like you to answer all of the questions, but we do <u>not</u> want you to sign your name. The things you say to the interviewer and the things you write will be treated confidentially. When the study is over, we will have collected information from several hundred young people in Edmonton. Nobody will know who said what.

Thank you for being an important part of this study. With your help we can learn more about how young people find jobs. If you would like to ask any questions about the study, please call 432-3315 (a number at the University) and ask for Dr. Lowe or Dr. Krahn who are both members of the research team.

EDMONTON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STUDY

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire should take you only a few minutes to finish. Reach each question carefully, and try to answer all of the questions. If the question is followed by a blank line, put in the answer that is being asked for. For example:

What school were you attending when you left school? _____
(name of school)

If the answers next to the question are followed by a number, circle the number next to the answer you choose. For example:

How many different high schools did you attend?
One.....1
Two.....2
Three.....3

Do not sign your name on this paper. When you are finished, the interviewer will give you an envelope and you can put this in it and seal it.

Thank you very much for your help in this study.

---

1. When were you born? _____ (day) _____ (month) _____ (year)

2. Sex: Female.....1
Male.....2

3. Right now, do you have a full-time job, a part-time job, or no job at all?
Full-time job.....1
Part-time job.....2
No job at all.....3

4. Has anyone else in your family been unemployed at some time during the past year? Who?

_____

5. What is your father's job? (Tell us what he does at work - is he a construction worker, a lawyer, a car salesman, or what? If you don't know, say so. If your father is unemployed, tell us what his regular job would be.)

_____

6. What is your mother's job? (Tell us what she does at work. If she is unemployed, what would her regular job be? And if she has always worked at home since you were young, tell us that.)

_____

7. How would you describe your family's financial situation?

Poverty level.....1
Somewhat below average.....2
Average.....3
Somewhat above average.....4
Wealthy.....5

8. In total, how many years of education does your father have? (count all types of education)

_____
(number of years)

9. In total, how many years of education does your mother have? (count all types of education)

_____
(number of years)

10. When you left school, what school were you attending?

_____
(name of school)

11. What program were you in when you left school?

Vocational.....1
Academic.....2
Business.....3
Trades and Services.....4

12. What was the highest grade you finished in high school?

_____
(grade finished)

13. Do you think you will ever get some more education (high school, NAIT, university, etc.)?

No.....1
Maybe.....2
Yes.....3

HERE ARE A FEW MORE QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT LIFE IN GENERAL.

For this set of questions circle one number for each.

14. How often in the past few months have you:

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
a. felt depressed	1	2	3	4	5
b. felt lonely	1	2	3	4	5
c. felt like doing nothing at all	1	2	3	4	5
d. felt like people were unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5
e. talked less than usual	1	2	3	4	5
f. felt angry	1	2	3	4	5
g. lost your temper	1	2	3	4	5
h. yelled at people	1	2	3	4	5
c. got into fights or arguments	1	2	3	4	5

For each of the following questions, tell us how much you agree or disagree that it describes you. If you agree strongly, circle number '5' and if you disagree strongly circle the number '1'. If you feel somewhere inbetween these two points, circle one of the inbetween numbers which best describes your feelings.

15. How much do you disagree or agree that:

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
a. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	1	2	3	4	5

b. At times I think that I am no good at all	1	2	3	4	5
c. I feel that I have a number of good qualities	1	2	3	4	5
d. I am able to do things as well as most other people	1	2	3	4	5
e. I certainly feel useless at times	1	2	3	4	5
f. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure	1	2	3	4	5

The next questions are about a part of young people's lives which we know little about -- things they might have done which could get them into trouble with the law. Some of these questions may be difficult for you to answer; they may be things you have told very few people. But if we are going to understand the lives of young people, we need each person to answer as honestly as possible. Remember, we do not want you to sign your name to this paper. If you still feel that you cannot answer a question honestly, we would prefer you leave it blank.

16. How many times in the last year have you:

	Number of times
a. been questioned by the police as a suspect about some crime?	_____
b. been convicted of some crime (other than traffic violations) in court?	_____
c. broken into a building or a car?	_____
d. taken something from a store without paying for it?	_____
e. sold marijuana or other non-prescription drugs?	_____
f. used physical force (like twisting an arm or choking) to get money or things from another person?	_____
g. attacked someone with a weapon or your fists, injuring them so badly they probably needed a doctor?	_____

h. got into a fight with someone just for the hell of it? ....._____

i. damaged or destroyed on purpose, property that did not belong to you? ....._____

j. other than from a store, taken something worth less than $50 which did not belong to you? ....._____

j. other than from a store, taken something worth more than $50 which did not belong to you? ....._____

For these few additional questions, again circle one number for each question.

17. How frequently do you:

	Every day	Several times a week	Once a week	Once or twice a month	Less than once a month	Never
a. drink beer, wine or other alcohol?	5	4	3	2	1	0
b. smoke marijuana or hash?	5	4	3	2	1	0
c. use other non-prescription drugs?	5	4	3	2	1	0

Finally, here are a few questions about your feelings about school and work in general. Like the earlier questions, circle one of the numbers between '1' and '5' to tell us how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

18. How much do you disagree or agree that:

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
a. If I could earn $15 an hour I would take any job	1	2	3	4	5

b. I'd rather collect welfare than work at a job I don't like	1	2	3	4	5
c. When unemployment is high, men should get jobs before women do	1	2	3	4	5
d. Most of the lessons at school are a complete waste of time	1	2	3	4	5
e. Many younger people who get welfare are just too lazy to work	1	2	3	4	5
f. Overall, I have enjoyed my time in high school	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you again for helping us with this study. The interviewer will give you an envelope in which to place this set of questions. Please seal the envelope and give it back to the interviewer.

Appendix III

Evaluating the Unemployment-Crime Relationship: Problems of Aggregate Data

One of the most pronounced concerns in criminology is the relationship between economic conditions and crime. From Bonger (1916) and Shaw and McKay (1942) to the present concern over economic recession caused unemployment, especially youth unemployment, a primary criminological question still stands largely unanswered, however. This question is -- how and to what degree does economic deprivation lead to crime?

Horwitz (1984) in the Annual Review of Sociology, states that one of the primary methodological, and indeed theoretical, bones of contention is whether to employ aggregate versus individual level data to answer this controversial question. As an earlier insightful text by Hannah (1971) notes, the problem of which level of analysis to use and of shift between them, has been a major unresolved problem in social analyses in general. However, as Hannah (1971) also notes, unfortunately the existence of this problem has only been recognized sporadically (cf. also Gupta, 1969).

In this research note, we analyze the findings from econometric and sociological research on the economic deprivation-crime relationship and examine the issue of what level of data has been utilized to delineate the relationship. Evaluating research on unemployment and crime is a key issue in much of the current popular and theoretical debate over economic conditions and crime (cf. Tanner et al., 1985; and Freeman, 1983).

As Orsagh and Witte (1981) note, an extensive review of empirical studies of the unemployment-crime thesis which utilize aggregate data has been provided by Gillespie (1975). According to Gillespie, three studies assert the existence of a statistically significant relationship between the unemployment rate and crime. However, seven studies found no significant relationship in their test of the thesis. Orsagh and Witte (1981) state that the evidence since Gillespie's survey provides no stronger support for the proposition that unemployment causes crime.

In support of this statement these authors report that while the longitudinal study by Land and Felson (1976) shows that the unemployment rate has no appreciable effect on the crime rate, Brenner (1976) contends that it does. However, the Center for Econometric Studies, they note, has shown that Brenner's results are extremely sensitive to changes in model specification. Brenner's results should thus, they contend, be regarded as inconclusive. Complicating matters even more, Fox (1978) using a simultaneous equations model and data for 1950-74, finds no relationship. Orsagh (1981), using quite a different model, but the same time frame, finds a positive but non-significant relationship.

Moving to a brief consideration of the post 1975 cross sectional literature, Orsagh and Witte (1981) conclude that the empirical evidence here is as equally ambiguous as the longitudinal research. As they note, Bartel (1979) reports positive coefficients for the female unemployment rate for most, but not all, specifications of her model. However, none of the coefficients are statistically significant. The Center for Econometric Studies finds a relation between crime rates and long-term unemployment, but no relation to short-term unemployment. Moreover, Forst (1976) as well as Wadycki and Balkin (1979) find no relation for index offences, whereas Vandaele (1978) reports no relation for automobile theft.

Orsagh and Witte (1981) conclude, subsequent to this discussion, that much of the inconsistency in the empirical literature derives from the fact that aggregate data is used to test the unemployment-crime relationship. These authors then proceed to outline in greater detail what they term, "the litany of deficiencies," which accrue when, "the theory has a micro-foundation, whereas the evidence is based on aggregate data," (Orsagh and Witte 1981:1062). Specifically, they contend that the empirical evidence defies definitive interpretation because of the uncertain correspondence between the empirical measure actually used and the measure that the theory requires. Let us consider their views on the issue of the measurement of the theoretically crucial variable of legitimate income.

Focusing upon one common measure, per capita income, they report that Grieson (1972), Beasley and Antunes (1974) and Swimmer (1974) use per capita income as an index of legitimate income. Fleisher (1966), Weicher (1970) and Sjoquist (1973), they add, use

measures analogous to per capita income and assign the same interpretation. Yet, Vandaele (1978) interprets per capita income as an index of the demand for illegal goods. Moreover, Orsagh and Witte (1981) note that other, equally respectable, authors such as Ehrlich (1973), McPheters and Stronge (1974), Forst (1976), and Bartel (1979) use the same measure as an index of illegitimate income. Control variables are, these authors state, used in the above studies in an effort to force the measure to reflect either legitimate or illegitimate income, as the particular study requires. However, they conclude that, unfortunately, the success of this endeavor cannot be scientifically demonstrated. Orsagh and Witte (1981:1061) thus state that, "One's interpretation of the measure becomes largely a matter of faith."

Continuing their critique, Orsagh and Witte (1981) state that interpreting the empirical research relating to legitimate income is further complicated, and comparative analysis rendered virtually meaningless, because of the many statistical proxies employed in the literature for this variable. For example, Beasley and Antunes (1974), Swimmer (1974), and Vandaele (1978) use per capita income. Fleisher (1966) and Weicher (1970), the mean family income of the second lowest quartile, Sjoquist (1973), the wages of manufacturing employees; Morris and Tweeten (1971) as well as Greenwood and Wadycki (1973) use the percentages of families living in poverty.

The problem and confusion here is certainly compounded by the fact that unemployment is itself a proxy indicator, or operationalization, of a higher order theoretical concern. For example, economic theories of crime are generally based upon conceptualizations of how the structural variable of social inequality is mediated at the individual level producing relative deprivation and/or reduced social controls. The presence or absence of employment is usually taken as an indicator of both social inequality and of relative deprivation/reduced controls. The uncritical utilization of the variable of unemployment in this proxy fashion is highly questionable and may lead to much of the inconsistency in research on the unemployment-crime thesis.

A further statement on the problems of measuring the unemployment-crime relationship, via aggregate data, concerns the dependent variable, criminal behavior. The most

promising results to date in aggregate data based efforts to test the unemployment causes crime thesis, according to Gillespie (1975) and Grainger (1981), come from longitudinal studies, in particular those using city time series data. However, as Braithwaite (1979) notes, there is much disagreement over which major historical variables to control for in a time series study and, most crucially, about the time lag to be allowed before changing economic conditions are presumed to have an impact on crime (cf. Ross, 1973). This author states that it may be that the differing ways that these methodological problems have been dealt with, account for some of the contradictions in the evidence on the relationship between crime and unemployment, particularly unemployment caused by fluctuations in the business cycle. Again the almost complete inadequacy of past aggregate-based attempts to assess the unemployment-crime relationship is asserted. For Braithwaite (1979:58) concludes that, "Whatever the source of the contradictions, polemical criminologists have found them a boon in enabling them to justify whatever position on poverty and crime that is intellectually convenient for them."

Perhaps the best summary of the findings, problems and potential solutions to the study of the unemployment-crime relationship comes from Grainger (1981:2). As that author stated in his review, the final conclusion from all the aggregate research would have to be that no firm evidence has been found for either an associative or a causal relationship between unemployment and crime. As he notes, the studies which claimed a positive correlation between the variables were riddled with methodological deficiencies and theoretical weaknesses: those which were of a higher methodological quality showed no such relationship.

Researchers such as Braithwaite (1979) would not go as far as Grainger (1981:3), when he states that, "the aggregate search for a connection between these variables should cease; enough effort has already been expended in this area." However, most researchers would support Grainger's observation on the potential of individual level analysis. For one fairly conclusive empirical fact in the debate on the unemployment-crime relationship, after approximately five decades of fairly sophisticated statistical research exists according to Grainger (1981). As Grainger (1981:3) notes, data collected on offenders generally reveal

that approximately 40% are unemployed when they commit a crime. However, Grainger (1981) further adds that unemployment is only one of the characteristics that offenders have in common. Grainger's (1981) overall conclusion is that the results of several controlled studies are in conflict, but there would appear to be enough evidence to suport a major study at the individual level to clarify the situation.

It is significant that essentially the same conclusion on the failure of aggregate tests of the unemployment-crime thesis generally voiced by Grainger (1981) has been formed by Pirog-Good (1981) in her study of youth unemployment. This author reviews the research on youth unemployment and delinquency/crime by Singell (1967), Glaser and Rice (1959), Fleisher (1963) and (1966), Weicher (1970), Phillips, Maxwell and Votey (1972) and Ehrlich (1973). Pirog-Good (1981:50-51) states subsequent to this empirical review that, the results of the complex analyses relating youth crime to economic conditions are confusing. Results of analyses that appear reasonable, she notes, are reversed when minor modifications to the variable construct are made. This suggests, as Pirog-Good (1981) states, that there is multicollinearity among the explanatory variables and that these models, from the simplest to the most complex, have not been well specified. Pirog-Good (1981) concludes her analysis with the statement that theory building and data base building in this field must be advanced before empirical analyses will yield stable and reasonable results. The bottom line for research in this area according to Pirog-Good (1981:51) is that, "there is a clear need for a more specific theoretical analysis, as well as a systematic micro-level [individual] empirical analysis of the relationship between youth crime and employment."

In closing one must note that this shift to individual level data is necessary, but not sufficient in order to unravel the complex linkage between economic deprivation and crime. One must also move away from conceptualizing the labour market factor as, "being unemployed, yes-no." Witte (1979), Grainger (1981), and Hackim (1982) each review a wide range of literature largely employing this dichotomized (un)employed variable, and state that it has been singularly unsuccessful at teasing out the contribution that success-failure in the labour market makes to involvement in crime.

Echoing earlier empirical research on youths by Erickson (1975), Witte (1979:30) states, "results seem to indicate that it is not so much individual unemployment per se which causes crime, but rather the failure to find relatively high wage satisfying employment." Hackim (1982:440) considers the problem of specifying the unemployment-crime relationship for young people, one of the primary groups of concern in the current economic recession. She notes that many young people switch in and out of generally low paying jobs quite frequently. The designation employed/unemployed at any one point in time may thus almost be a matter of chance.

She also notes that the impact of unemployment may vary with the frequency and duration of unemployment. Hackim (1982:440) states that individuals with repeated spells of short-term unemployment may not experience the same shock at job loss as those with no previous unemployment experience. However, Hackim (1982:440) notes that they might be particularly hard-hit, in that the total unemployment experience would have cumulative effects on their financial and social circumstances, and indeed even their employability.

Hackim (1982) states, as does a major 1984 Canadian Ministry for Youth publication, that when studying the potential impact of employment on delinquency/crime, the best approach would be to analyze the early work history of individuals. Here one would keep track of the total duration of unemployment, as well as the pattern of labour market activity (i.e. employed full/part-time etc.). Individual level research employing this 'labour market integration' variable would appear to provide the best avenue for explicating the relationship between labour market-based economic deprivation and crime.

Appendix IV

Descriptive Statistics for Labour Market Variables: Currently Employed and Unemployed Respondents

---

For the Currently Unemployed:

Length of Current Unemployment

Table A1 reveals that 58% of sample members currently unemployed had up to the time of interview experienced short-term unemployment, i.e. 1 to 6 months. Twenty two percent of currently unemployed respondents could be classified as currently experiencing long-term unemployment (7-12 months of unemployment) and 19% had currently experienced unemployment for greater than one year. A greater percentage of males currently unemployed had up to the time of interview experienced short-term unemployment; 67% of males but 42% of females were unemployed for only 1-6 months. Younger respondents also reported a greater amount of current short-term unemployment than older (71% and 38%, respectively).

This age difference in respondents' unemployment experience may partly reflect the more limited time period in the labour market for younger subjects. However, it may also indicate that younger workers were willing to take, for a short period of time at least, relatively low-paying dead-end jobs (i.e. telephone/counter sales, etc.) The fact that younger sample members were also more likely than older to report having experienced previous short-term (1-6 months) unemployment lends credence to this latter assertion.[94]

---

[94]The exact values here are 50% (8) and 18% (4) for younger and older workers, respectively. Given the low numbers of respondents involved these differences must, however, be viewed with caution.

TABLE A1

Length Of Current Unemployment

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
1 to 6 months	58%(39)	67%(29)/42%(10)	38%(11)/71%(25)
7 to 12 months	22%(15)	19%(8)/29%(7)	28%(8)/20%(7)
Over 12 months	19%(13)	14%(6)/29%(7)	35%(10)/ 9%(3)
Total (N)	(67)	(43)/(24)	(29)/(35)

Have Respondents Been Unemployed Before

As can be seen from Table A2, among those sample members currently unemployed 72% had been unemployed for a previous period of time. Males were somewhat more likely than females to report being unemployed previously (77% of males and 64% of females, respectively). Perhaps not surprisingly given their greater time period in the labour market, older sample members were more likely than younger to report having been unemployed previously (83% and 61%, respectively).

The mean number of months of previous unemployment experienced by these sample members was 12.4. However, females were more likely to experience somewhat greater unemployment than males, as the average number of months of previous unemployment was 13.9 for females and 11.4 for males. Thirty one percent of currently unemployed sample members reported experiencing 1 to 6 months of previous unemployment; 46% reported 7 to 12 months of previous unemployment and 23% reported 13 to 48 months of previous unemployment.

TABLE A2

Have Respondents Been Unemployed Previously

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
PREVIOUSLY UNEMPLOYED	72%(46)	77%(30)/64%(16)	83%(26)/61%(20)
LENGTH OF PREVIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT			
1 to 6 months	31%(12)	30%(7)/31%(5)	18%(4)/50%(8)
7 to 12 months	46%(18)	48%(11)/44%(7)	50%(11)/38%(6)
13 to 48 months	23%(9)	22%(5)/25%(4)	32%(7)/13%(2)
Total (N)	(39)	(23)/(16)	(22)/(16)

Number and Length of Jobs Since High School

From Table A3 it can be seen that 14% of currently unemployed sample members had not had a single job since leaving high school. These individuals were more likely to be younger and female. Fifty four percent of those sample respondents currently unemployed had 1 to 3 jobs since high school and a further 32% of respondents had over 4 jobs since leaving school. Females in the sample were more likely than males to report having had few jobs (i.e. up to 3) since leaving high school (83% and 57%, respectively).

In terms of length of previous job held, 53% of the sample members currently unemployed report having had only short-term jobs previously.[95] Thirty three percent report a combination of short and long-term jobs, whereas only 14% report having had only long-term jobs previously. Consistent with the already noted greater number of jobs held by males, males were more likely than females to report having had only short-term employment after leaving school (59% of males but 41% of females). The majority of younger respondents had only short-term jobs previously. On the other hand, about two thirds of the older respondents report having at least some long-term jobs since leaving school.

[95]In the Edmonton Youth Employment Project dropout data set, short-term jobs were jobs of 2-3 months duration; jobs longer than this were deemed long-term.

TABLE A3

Number and Length of Respondents' Jobs Since High School

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
NUMBER OF JOBS			
0	14%(10)	7%(3)/23%(7)	3%(1)/21%(8)
1 to 3	54%(40)	50%(22)/60%(18)	50%(17)/58%(22)
Over 4	32%(24)	43%(19)/17%(5)	47%(16)/21%(8)
Total (N)	(74)	(44)/(30)	(34)/(38)
LENGTH OF JOBS			
Short-term	53%(35)	59%(26)/41%(9)	33%(11)/74%(23)
Short/Long-term	33%(22)	32%(14)/36%(8)	42%(14)/23%(7)
Long-term	14%(9)	9%(4)/23%(5)	24%(8)/ 3%(1)
Total (N)	(66)	(44)/(22)	(33)/(31)

Table A4 presents data on the number of jobs applied for in an average week during the present and/or previous period(s) of unemployment. [96] Thirty eight percent of sample members currently unemployed reported applying for up to 3 jobs per week. Thirty five percent of these sample members reported applying for an average of 4-10 jobs per week, while 27% reported applying for more than 10 jobs per week. Indeed several sample members report applying for up to 20 or 30 jobs per week. As an analysis of the interview transcripts reveals, much of this type of extensive job seeking takes place when respondents go from store to store in shopping malls etc. applying for one sales clerk position after another.

As can be seen from Table A4, while many respondents report applying for a relatively large number of jobs per week, females are less likely than males to apply for only up to 3 jobs per week, and are more likely to apply for more than 10 jobs per week. This job

[96] 13% (7) of the sample reported that they did not apply for any jobs in an average week of unemployment. However, we must be careful here not to infer that these sample members are necessarily uninterested in working. One primary reason for this assertion is that some workers wanting jobs may become discouraged by the realities of a recession-plagued labour market, i.e. employers not hiring and/or only low paying, dead-end jobs available.

application differential may reflect the fact that males are more likely to seek relatively scarce good jobs, which will enable them to fulfill traditional sex-role expectations of the male as primary bread winner. There were no notable differences between older and younger dropouts in terms of the number of jobs applied for in an average week.

TABLE A4

Number of Jobs Respondents Applied For Per Average Week

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
NUMBER OF JOBS			
0 to 3	38%(21)	42%(16)/29%(5)	37%(8)/39%(12)
4 to 10	35%(19)	34%(13)/35%(6)	36%(8)/32%(10)
10 or More	27%(15)	24%(9)/35%(6)	27%(6)/29%(9)
Total (N)	(65)	(38)/(17)	(22)/(31)

For the Currently Employed:

Length of Time at Current Job

As can be seen from Table A5, among those sample members currently employed 59% had been employed for 1 to 6 months at time of interview; 18% had been currently employed for 7 to 12 months and 23% had been employed for over a year. There were no major differences in the length of current employment for males and females. Younger sample members were, however, more likely than older members to have been currently employed for a brief period (1 to 6 months) and much less likely to have been currently employed for over a year. The respective percentages here are 46% and 71% for current short-term employment at time of interview. For long-term employment the percentages for younger/older sample members are 10% and 42%, respectively. We must recognize that the generally shorter time in the labour market for younger dropouts may play a significant role in producing these age differences in length of current job.

TABLE A5

Respondents' Length of Time at Current Job

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
LENGTH OF CURRENT JOB			
1 to 6 months	59%(33)	62%(13)/57%(20)	46%(11)/71%(22)
7 to 12 months	18%(10)	14%(3)/20%(7)	13%(3)/19%(6)
13 to 42 months	23%(13)	24%(5)/23%(8)	42%(10)/10%(3)
Total (N).	(56)	(21)/(35)	(24)/(31)

Number of Other Jobs Respondent Has Had and Their Duration

From Table A6 it can be seen that 65% of currently employed dropouts had up to 3 previous jobs, while 35% had 4 to 8 jobs previously. Sample members currently employed were thus somewhat less likely than those currently unemployed to have experienced a large number of previous jobs. There were no major male-female differences among currently employed respondents in terms of number of previous jobs held. Younger sample members in this group were, however, more likely than older to report having had few jobs (up to 3) previously (79% and 51%, respectively). This is perhaps not surprising given the more limited time in the labour market for younger sample members.

Thirty nine percent of currently employed sample members reported having previously had only short-term (i.e. 6 months or less) jobs. The majority (53%) of these sample members, however, report having previously had a combination of short and long-term jobs. Only 9% of currently employed dropouts reported having had only long-term previous employment. Sample members currently employed were less likely than those currently unemployed to report having had only short-term jobs (39% and 53%, respectively). There were essentially no male-female differences in the length of previous jobs held by currently employed dropouts. However, younger sample members were more likely than older to report

having previously had only short-term employment (56% and 27%, respectively).

TABLE A6

Number of Respondents' Other Jobs and Their Duration

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
NUMBER OF OTHER JOBS			
0 to 3	65%(45)	60%(18)/69%(27)	51%(18)/79%(27)
4 to 8	35%(24)	40%(12)/31%(12)	49%(17)/21%(7)
Total (N)	(69)	(30)/(39)	(35)/(34)
LENGTH OF OTHER JOBS			
Short-term	39%(25)	39%(10)/40%(15)	27%(10)/56%(15)
Short/Long-term	53%(34)	50%(13)/55%(21)	62%(23)/41%(11)
Long-term	9%(5)	12%(3)/ 5%(2)	11%(4)/ 4%(1)
Total (N)	(64)	(26)/(38)	(37)/(27)

Have Respondents Ever Been Unemployed/Length of Unemployment

As can be seen from Table A7, among those sample members currently employed 82% report having been unemployed previously. Males in this group were slightly more likely than females to report having been unemployed previously (87% and 78%, respectively). There were virtually no differences between currently employed younger and older sample members in terms of their being previously unemployed.

Table A7 also reveals that 48% of sample members who reported being unemployed previously had experienced 1 to 6 months of unemployment; 32% of this sample sub-group reported experiencing 7 to 12 months of unemployment, and 20% reported having experienced more than a year of total unemployment prior to their present job. Currently employed males were more likely than females to report having experienced only 1 to 6 months of previous unemployment (59% and 41%, respectively). Conversely, females were more likely than males

to report experiencing both intermediate (7 to 12 months) and high (over 1 year) amounts of previous unemployment. Younger sample members in this group more frequently reported having experienced only 1 to 6 months of previous unemployment than older respondents (65% and 37%, respectively). Older respondents were more likely to have experienced both more intermediate (7 to 12 months) and high (over 1 year) amounts of cumulative previous unemployment, no doubt at least in part due to their greater length of exposure to the labour market.

TABLE A7

Have Respondents Ever Been Unemployed/Length of Unemployment

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
PREVIOUSLY UNEMPLOYED			
Yes	82%(62)	87%(26)/78%(36)	84%(31)/79%(30)
TOTAL LENGTH OF PREVIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT			
1 to 6 months	48%(26)	59%(13)/41%(13)	37%(11)/65%(15)
7 to 12 months	32%(17)	27%(6)/34%(11)	37%(11)/22%(5)
13 to 48 months	20%(11)	14%(3)/25%(8)	27%(8)/13%(3)
Total (N)	(164)	(22)/(32)	(30)/(23)

Were Respondents Satisfied/Dissatisfied With Current Job

While most respondents have already been described as working in relatively dead-end jobs, as can be seen from Table A8, most report being at least somewhat satisfied (66%) with their current jobs. Males were, however, more likely than females to report being satisfied with their current job (72% and 62%, respectively). There were essentially no differences between older and younger subjects in terms of reported current job satisfaction.

When currently employed respondents were asked what they liked about their jobs, 35% (22) stated that they enjoyed the job generally, which included simply keeping them

busy; 29% (18) stated that they liked the job because of the people that they worked with, and 18% (11) stated that they enjoyed the work itself. Very few respondents reported being satisfied with the pay and benefits, the hours, job mobility or their supervisors. Based upon these facts it would seem reasonable to propose that most individuals who report being relatively satisfied with their jobs enjoy the opportunity to keep busy and to interact with other individuals, either co-workers or the public. This satisfaction from working in economically marginal jobs may be due to the fact that most currently employed respondents have experienced previous unemployment, which promotes excessive social isolation and boredom (cf. Krahn, Lowe and Tanner, 1984).

TABLE A8

Were Respondents Satisfied/Dissatisfied With Current Job?

	Total Sub-Sample	Male/Female	Older/Younger
Satisfied	66%(47)	72%(21)/62%(26)	66%(23)/66%(23)
Hard to Tell	28%(20)	21%(6)/33%(14)	26%(9)/31%(11)
Dissatisfied	6%(4)	7%(2)/ 5%(2)	9%(3)/ 3%(1)
Total (N)	(71)	(29)/(42)	(35)/(35)